

The Classical Review

JUNE 1897.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

VI., VII. THE CONSTITUTIONS.

(Continued from page 136.)

WHEN we turn to the *Respublica Atheniensium*, the conclusion is just the reverse of that which was drawn from our scrutiny of the *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum*. There is not in the language of it any word or any use of a word that is noticeably characteristic of X. No doubt the treatise is a very short one. In the Teubner text it barely fills thirteen pages, while the *R.L.* fills twenty-one. But thirteen pages give ample room for a peculiar vocabulary, such as we have now partly observed, to show itself, and yet I do not think a single thing can be pointed out that would suggest X.'s authorship to any one ignorant of the tradition. The uses of *ὥς* above mentioned are not to be found, though *ἵνα* with subjunctive and *ὥστε* with infinitive occur. *Ἔως* is used two or three times, not *ἔστε*: *ὅπου* repeatedly, never *ἐνθα*: there is, I think, no *σύν*, no *ἀμφί*, not a single *μῦν*. Not one of the many words unfamiliar in Attic prose but affected by X. is here employed. Though some easy-going readers may not realise the significance of these facts, close observers of language know what they mean. There is not one of the undoubted works of X. that is not marked by peculiarities of language capable of being detected by any moderately careful student. Even the first two books of the *Hellenica*, which have been thought to be early work, contain examples (to take one point only) of X.'s characteristic use of *ὥς*.

NO. XCVII. VOL. XI.

But in the *R.A.* there is no Xn. peculiarity of any kind.

We next go on to ask, as in the case of the *R.L.*, whether the language contains anything positive that X. probably could not or would not have used, or that is, at any rate, not in keeping with his usual manner of expression. There are a few things of this sort that may be pointed out. In speaking of politics X. does not use the names *οἱ γενναῖοι* and *οἱ χρηστοί* for the wealthy and well-born, as this writer habitually does. To X. they are the *καλοὶ καγαθοί*, etc. Indeed I doubt whether any other Greek prose writer uses *γενναῖοι* and *χρηστοί* in this semi-technical sense. When Aristotle speaks of the *γενναῖοι* in the *Politics*, he is not using a set term. *Πονηροί* is sometimes opposed to these words in the *R.A.*, though *δῆμος* and *οἱ πένητες* are used more frequently: but *πονηροί* is not strange to X.'s usage. Cf. *Hell.* 2, 3, 13-14 where *οἱ πονηροί* are opposed to *οἱ καλοὶ καγαθοί*. *Thuc.* 8, 47 uses *πονηρία* = *δημοκρατία*. I can not find in X. any parallel to the absolute use of *δυνάμενος* in 2, 18 *πλούσιος ἢ γενναῖος ἢ δυνάμενος*, but in *Thuc.* 6, 39, 2 and *Plat. Gorg.* 525 E we have *οἱ δυνάμενοι* used in the same way. *Δημόται* = *δημοτικοί* in 1. 4 would be unusual, though X. uses it so (*Mem.* 1, 2, 58: *Cyr.* 2, 3, 7), but probably we should read *δημοτικοί* here as in the two sentences before and after. (The

best MSS. seem, however, to have *ιδιωται*, not *δημόται*.) In 1, 6 and 9 *οι δεξιώτατοι* are 'the ablest men,' and *δεξιός* is familiar enough in this sense, but it seems not to occur in X. (Thuc. in a doubtful chapter (3, 82, 15) has *δεξιοί* 'clever' and *δεξιότης* in 3, 37, 3). *Διαίτημα* (1, 8) is used in *Mem.* 1, 6, 5 of matters of diet: it is not used in X. of political institutions, practices, etc. as here. Its use in Thuc. 1, 6, 2 is not exactly political. *Ἰσηγορία* (1, 12) is not found in X. *Κακονομία* (1, 8) I do not know where to find at all, but Herodotus 1, 65 has *κακόννομος*. *Ευθενεῖν* (2, 6) and *ἐπιμίγεσθαι* (2, 7) are not Xn. All these are words of a more or less political or social connotation, the absence of which from X. as compared with their presence here seems to deserve remark.

Taking words of a different kind, we may notice that *ὀλίγιστος* (1, 5 etc.) is a form never used by X.: that *αὐτόθι* (1, 2 and *passim*) is always used by this writer for *ἐκεῖ*, whereas X. makes free use of *ἐκεῖ* and *ἐνταῦθα* as well (in 1, 11 here *ἐνταῦθα* is used vaguely, in correspondence with *ὅπου*): that *ἀντιβολεῖν* (1, 18) does not occur in X., nor *λωβᾶσθαι* (2, 13), nor *περιτιθέναι* used as in the expression *τὴν δυνάμιν περιτιθέναι* (1, 2), nor *ὅσ' ἔτη* (3, 4-5 three times) or any similar phrase, nor *φέρει δὴ* (3, 5-6 twice), nor *ὡς ἀληθῶς* (2, 19: see Schanz in *Hermes* 21, 456). The author makes use once of *ἄττα* (2, 17), twice of the so-called article or demonstrative pronoun in a curious way (2, 8 *τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς, τοῦτο δ' ἐκ τῆς*: *ib.* 12 *τὸ μὲν τῇ, τὸ δὲ τῇ*): more than once of a *σύ*, addressed to an imaginary reader, and an *ἐγώ*, used of an imaginary self, which are certainly curious: none of these occur in X.

The use of particles is very restricted and therefore very unlike X. *Μέν, δέ, οὖν* occur often enough, but the so-called 'anaphora' with *μέν* and *δέ*, of which X. is very fond, only once (3, 2 *πολλὰ μὲν..., πολλὰ δέ..., πολλὰ δέ..., πολλὰ δέ..., πολλὰ δέ...*): *αἷ* and *δ'* *αἷ* three or four times. *Ἐπειτα* frequently corresponds to *πρῶτον μὲν*. *Δή* is used extremely little (1, 18 *ὅς ἐστι δὴ νόμος Ἀθήνησι*; 2, 11 *καὶ δὴ* 'suppose': 3, 2 *ἄρα δὴ*, a conjunction of particles perhaps not to be found elsewhere and at any rate very uncommon, as is also Cobet's *ἄρα δῆτα*: 3, 5 and 7 *φέρει δὴ*: 3, 9 *ὅπως δὴ*). *Πάνν* is found twice (2, 3: 3, 5): *τοι* only in 3, 13, for in 3, 10 it can hardly be right: *ἄρα* in 3, 12. Even *γε* does not occur more than two or perhaps three times: *γῶν* perhaps in 1, 13, but it may be *οὖν*. *Καὶ-δέ* is not found, nor, as was said above, X.'s favourite and indispensable *μήν*.

In the syntax there seems nothing

distinctly noticeable. The use of *αἰροῦμαι* with accusative and infinitive (1, 1 *εἰλοντο τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀμεινον πράττειν*) is rare and might be plausibly explained by the loss of a *τό*, but it is paralleled in Plato *Phil.* 44 A. The passives *χορηγείται ὁ δῆμος...ὁ δὲ δῆμος τρυφαρχεῖται* (1, 13) are a little odd, but we are familiar with something like the first of them in Aristotle's *κεχορηγμένος* and *ἀχορηγῆτος*. The accusative after *ἀχθομαι* (2, 18 *ὥστ' οὐδὲ τοὺς τοιοῦτους ἀχθονται κωμωδουμένους*) occurs in *Iliad* 5, 361: 13, 352: and in Eupolis *fragm.* 43. Similar uses with *χαίρω, ἡδομαι, γέγηθα* etc. may be found in Homer and later poets (*γέγηθα τὸν ἄνδρα* Cratinus *fragm.* 158). Aristotle's *τοὺς πατραλοίας καὶ μαιφόνους, ὅταν τύχῃσι τιμωρίας, οὐδέεις ἂν λυπηθείη χρηστός* (*Rhet.* 2, 9, 1386 b 28) is perhaps rather anacoluthic than an instance of this construction, which seems somewhat poetical and old.

On the whole it may be said that the positive facts, though far from conclusive against X.'s authorship, go to strengthen the argument derived from the negative evidence, the absence of regular Xn. expressions. On the ground of this marked difference of style, consisting mainly but not entirely in the absence of all such turns of expression as we know from the body of his writings to have been habitually used by X., we ought to have no hesitation in adopting the opinion now generally held among scholars, though they have perhaps usually arrived at it in another way, that the book is the work of another man. Cobet indeed, whose opinion when given with due care outweighs that of many ordinary scholars, thought it X.'s, but further examination would probably have made him change his mind, as he did the reverse way with regard to the *R.L.*

But there suggests itself here another kindred question. Can any inference be drawn from the character of the Greek as to the date at which it was written? On this point the most conflicting views have been held, resting both on the language and on the contents. It has been deemed earlier than any extant comedy of Aristophanes (425 B.C.): it has also been ascribed to Macedonian times. Is it our earliest specimen of Attic prose literature? or is it, as J. J. Hartman seems to think, composed at a late date by some one who had, like ourselves, the older Attic writers before him and who put together from his study of them a sort of imaginary political argument? As regards the language there would seem to be in such a question two

things to go by. One is the observation of particular facts of language, positive or negative, the presence or absence, that is, of this or that word, form, idiom, etc.: the other is the feeling aroused by whole sentences and paragraphs.

With regard to the first of these, I do not think any clear or strong evidence is forthcoming. The book is so short and our knowledge of early Attic prose is so limited, that very little can be made out, as it seems to me, on this head. I will call attention, however, to a few small things. One of the most noticeable, though it may seem small enough, is the fact that the writer always uses *σφῶν αὐτῶν*, etc. never *ἐαυτῶν*, etc. Kühner, who notices this, points out (1, § 168) that the older Attic prose-writers usually employ *σφῶν αὐτῶν*, etc., except in the case of a possessive *ἐαυτῶν* following the article, e.g. *τὰ ἐαυτῶν* (we have in the *R.A.* 2, 14 *οὐδὲν τῶν σφῶν*, if this is not a mistake for *σφετέρων*), but that the other form gradually established itself as the one in common use. See too Meisterhans, § 59. Except in the *Hellenics* and one or two isolated instances X. uses *ἐαυτῶν*. The invariable use of the longer form in the *R.A.* therefore points to an early date. So to some extent does the use of the simple *σφίσι*, (1, 3 and 14) which gets rarer and rarer in Attic (occasional in X. and even in Demosthenes; never, I think, in Aristophanes, but his sentences did not want it): and the use of the pronoun *οἱ* (2, 17) of which the same may be said (never, I think, in Lysias, Isocrates, or Demosthenes): but not much stress can be laid on these words. *Ἄτε* occurs freely in Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, sometimes in lyrical poetry, whereas it is practically unknown in the orators and in comedy (it is said to occur once in Aristophanes and once in a fragment of Cratinus). We may therefore conclude it to be a mark of an early vocabulary rather than a late. We find it here twice (1, 20: 2, 14). *ἄσσα* or *ἄρτα* (2, 17) belongs, I think, more to old Attic than to new, if we may judge from its frequency in Aristophanes compared with its rarity or absence in the fragments of the New Comedy. Jacob's index in Meineke gives no example from the latter. We find it only twice in all Demosthenes, and apparently not at all in Lysias: pretty often in Plato, but this is consistent with its being old-fashioned. On the other hand neither Thucydides (who twice has *ἄρτα*) nor, I think, X. uses it. It is noticeable again that the author of the *R.A.* uses not

ἐκεῖ or *ἐνταῦθα*, but *αὐτόθι* (1, 2, etc.): this, if I am not mistaken, also goes slightly in the same direction, for we must observe the absence of *ἐκεῖ* as well as the use of *αὐτόθι*. The author uses *ἐνι* for *ἐνέστι* (1, 5 and 16), but this is found in all ages of Attic. He also uses *ἐνιοι* (2, 10) and *ἐνίστε* (2, 4: 3, 1) which do not occur at all in Thucydides, and in Aristophanes only in the latest of the comedies (*Plut.* 867, 1125). Herodotus, however, and Hippocrates use *ἐνιοι* and Hippocrates at any rate *ἐνίστε*. I take some of the words mentioned above, such as *ἐπιμίσχομαι*, and *ὀλίγιστος*, to belong rather to the older language. So does *ἐξαπναῖος* (3, 5) which is found two or three times in X. and in the adverbial form in Thucydides, not in the orators nor even in Plato, though the latter once has *ἐξαπίνης*.

The very small use of particles, on which I have remarked above, seems also to indicate an early date. So does the very small use of the infinitive with an article (see Goodwin, § 788 and notes), which will, however, be found in 1, 3: 2, 17 and a few other places. The complete indifference to hiatus is an argument *pro tanto* in the same direction.

I do not know of anything in the language of the book that tells the other way and in favour of a comparatively late date, unless it be the *ττ* in such words as *πράττειν*, *ἥττους* (there seem to be some variations in the MSS.: Dindorf, p. xvi.), and the *σ* in *σύν*. But we know too little about these spellings in literature to attach much importance to them, and in any case what we now find in the MSS. of the *R.A.* could not be taken as good evidence. In a work regarded as X.'s divergences of spelling were likely enough to be removed. The author may quite well have written *πράσσειν*, though we do not find it in his text.

If now we pass away from the consideration of single words and phrases and ask what impression with regard to the age of the Greek is made by the general cast and style of the sentences, it is not very easy to give any confident answer, and as a matter of fact scholars have not been agreed. The most striking feature of the style to my mind is the extreme simplicity of it, a simplicity greater, when we consider the subject-matter, than that of Lysias or perhaps even of Caesar. The words are the simplest and, so to say, baldest that could be found: the sentences are extraordinarily simple in their structure, and their succession and mutual relations are of the most elementary kind. This might be consciously

elaborated by a skilful writer, but the impression it makes on me is certainly that of early prose. It has not the stiffness of Thucydides, when reasoning, and of Antiphon: it shows no sign of art, unless it be the art of studied simplicity. There is a slight archaic formality about it now and then, which belongs to the fifth century rather than the fourth: I mean especially the repetition in neighbouring clauses of identical words, which a writer who had come under the influence of professors of style would have been likely to vary or omit. The first two sections of the book will illustrate this habit, which Blass too has noticed. Take the beginning of it, *περὶ δὲ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας, ὅτι μὲν εἶλοντο τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τῆς πολιτείας οὐκ ἔπαινώ διὰ τὸδε, ὅτι ταῦθ' ἐλόμενοι εἶλοντο τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀμεινον πράττειν ἢ τοὺς χρηστούς: διὰ μὲν τοῦτο οὐκ ἔπαινώ*, and observe the repetition of *εἶλοντο* after *ἐλόμενοι* and still more of *διὰ μὲν τοῦτο οὐκ ἔπαινώ*. Then in *πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοῦτο ἐρῶ ὅτι δικαίως δοκοῦσιν* (so Kirchhoff) *αὐτόθι οἱ πένητες καὶ ὁ δῆμος πλέον ἔχειν τῶν γενναίων καὶ τῶν πλουσίων διὰ τὸδε ὅτι ὁ δῆμος ἐστὶν ὁ ἐλαίνων τὰς ναῦς καὶ ὁ τὴν δύναμιν περιτιθεῖς τῇ πόλει: καὶ οἱ κυβερνήται καὶ οἱ κελυσταὶ καὶ οἱ πεντηκόνταρχοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτα καὶ οἱ ναυπηγοὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὴν δύναμιν περιτιθέντες τῇ πόλει πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ οἱ ὀπλίται καὶ οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ οἱ χρηστοί*, observe the repetition in *τὴν δύναμιν περιτιθέντες τῇ πόλει* and in *οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ οἱ χρηστοί*. Cf. 2, 11 *εἰ γὰρ τις πόλις πλουτεῖ ξύλοις ναυπηγησίμοις, ποῖ διαθήσεται, εἰ μὴ πείσῃ τοὺς ἀρχοντας τῆς θαλάττης; τί δ' εἰ τις σιδήρῳ ἢ χαλκῷ ἢ λίθῳ πλουτεῖ πόλις, ποῖ διαθήσεται, εἰ μὴ πείσῃ τοὺς ἀρχοντας τῆς θαλάττης;* or 3, 10 *ἐν οὐδεμῇ γὰρ πόλει τὸ βέλτιστον εἶναι ἐστὶ τῷ δήμῳ, ἀλλὰ τὸ κάκιστον ἐν ἐκάστῃ ἐστὶ πόλει εἶναι τῷ δήμῳ;* or the two last sections of the book. Somewhat similar is the careful repetition of a preposition before each of the words it governs and, as in the second sentence quoted, of the article with every substantive. All this has an old-fashioned unsophisticated air about it, though the air may have been assumed. But it must be allowed at the same time that Greek writing of all ages occasionally shows something of the kind I am dwelling upon. In saying therefore that the style of the *R.A.* feels like the style of early times, I admit that my impression, though decided, is not one for which I can assign a reason convincing to other people, and such impressions are not much to be trusted.

Returning now for a moment to the question of authorship, I would repeat that on

the ground of language alone, observing first and mainly the un-Xenophontean, and secondly the probably early, character of it, we may conclude the treatise not to be X.'s. But when we take into account the further considerations, with which in this article I do not deal, derived from the matter of the book, the argument seems to become overwhelming. The tone and spirit of the writer are absolutely unlike the tone and spirit of X. All the indications given by reference to matters of fact seem to point to a date earlier than his. Athens is not only a strong naval power, but undisputed mistress of the sea. The *φόρος* is still paid by her subject-states. Their citizens still come to her courts for the decision of lawsuits. The sovereign people must not be laughed at in a comedy, though Demos is unmistakably laughed at in a certain famous play which won the prize in 424 and has been preserved to our own times. The reputed X. lays it down that a man of the people is not attacked in comedy, *ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πολυπραγμοσύνην καὶ διὰ τὸ ζητεῖν πλέον τι ἔχειν τοῦ δήμου*, though Socrates, X.'s master and hero, was grossly caricatured on the Athenian stage in 423.

Language therefore and contents alike make it certain that Xenophon was not the author.

This would seem to be the place for hazarding a conjecture on the passage in Diogenes Laertius, which ranks the *R.A.* among the writings of X. but mentions a doubt that had been expressed about the *R.L.* He gives (2, 6, 13) a list of X.'s works, ending thus—*Ἀγροικαὶν τε καὶ Ἀθηναίων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτείαν, ἣν φησιν οὐκ εἶναι Ξενοφάντος ὁ Μάγνης Δημήτριος*. Demetrius Magnes, a contemporary of Cicero, appears also to have denied the authenticity of the speech against Demosthenes ascribed to Dinarchus. He denied it on the ground of style (*πολὺ γὰρ ἀπέχει τοῦ χαρακτήρος* ap. Dion. Hal. *de Din. Iudic.* 1). I have shown that in the case of the *R.L.* there is no reason on grounds of style for denying X.'s authorship, whereas in the case of the *R.A.* there is very strong reason indeed. I conjecture that it was in reality the *R.A.* and not the *R.L.* of which the genuineness was denied by Demetrius, and that the names of the two *Constitutions* have accidentally changed places in Diogenes' list. This might very easily happen, and some slight confirmation of the suspicion may perhaps be found in the fact that the traditional order seems to put the *R.A.* after, not before the *R.L.* In all Kirchhoff's

MSS. with the exception of one (to which the *R.A.* and the *De Vectigalibus* have been prefixed subsequently, belonging really to a quite different *codex*) the *R.L.* seems to come first and the *R.A.* second. The order in Diogenes is the reverse of this. I suggest that he really mentioned the *R.A.* last, and that it was the *R.A.* which Demetrius called in question.

Bergk (*Griech. Lit.* iv. p. 312) supposes X.'s son Diodorus to have erroneously included the *R.A.* in an 'edition' of X.'s works. Diodorus ought to have known his father's style better, especially if, as Bergk fancies, he adopted it so well upon occasion.

There are one or two further questions on which a word may be said. First, was the *R.A.* written by an Athenian and at Athens? There is nothing to imply Athenian birth, except that twice in 1, 12 the writer uses the first person plural in speaking of what was done at Athens (*ἰσχυροῖαν...ἐποιήσαμεν*). This may seem conclusive, but as he never uses this way of speaking elsewhere, but throughout the book speaks of the Athenians in the third person, and as *ἐποιήσαν* could be corrupted to *ἐποιήσαμεν* without much difficulty, I do not feel very confident that the author really used the first person here. Weiske thought *ἐποιήσαν* should be read, and Schneider inclined to agree. In 1, 11 Kirchhoff's *λαμβάνομεν* is a very doubtful conjecture; but, if right, it is general and impersonal in meaning, like the *ἡμῖν* in 2, 12 which Dindorf (p. xvi.) misunderstood. The author habitually expresses 'at Athens' as I have noticed above, by *αὐτόθι*, which certainly means 'there,' not 'here.' Indeed I am not sure that *αὐτόθι* ever means distinctly 'here,' though L. and S. say it sometimes does. Nor is there anything else in the book, as far as I can see, which indicates any personal interest in Athenian affairs, or at all implies Athenian authorship. There is a tone of absolute aloofness about the whole composition, such as we are accustomed to find in Aristotle. On the other hand it is written apparently in the purest Attic Greek, and the author is familiar with Athenian institutions and customs. There would seem therefore to be no sufficient ground for deciding between two or three possible alternatives. He may have been an Athenian writing away from Athens, like Xenophon: he may have been an Athenian writing in Athens, but by the use of *αὐτόθι* putting aside his 'local habitation': he may, for anything I can see, have been a Greek of some other origin, perhaps

an Athenian metic, who had a command of the Attic idiom. Attempts not only to fix the authorship on an Athenian but to name him seem unreasonable.

Again, have we only fragments and excerpts of a considerably longer work? I can see no good reason for thinking so. No doubt our text is imperfect in many places, and often we cannot reasonably hope to restore it. But there is no evidence of more than corruption and the loss of a few words or lines. No doubt, too, the author might have found many other things to say, but the treatise is fairly consecutive, and from its own point of view we have no right to regard it as obviously incomplete. Its argument is that, granted democracy and command of the sea, Athenian institutions are intelligent and intelligible enough, and that the Athenian people are by no means such fools as some of their critics deem them. This is worked out in application to several subjects, and then the treatise comes to an end.

Cobet held the opposite view and suggested, without laying much stress upon it, that the longer original work was a dialogue (written by X. himself), of which we have only fragments put together without the dialogue form. *Colloquii obscura quaedam vestigia cernere mihi videor* he says, founding himself on the above-noticed curious use of *σύ* and *σός*, which he cannot believe to be used of an imaginary reader. (Wachsmuth, as I gather from Rettig's paper on the *R.A.*, has worked out this dialogue theory elaborately.) The passage on which Cobet seems to lay most stress is 1, 11 *ὅπου δ' εἰσὶ πλούσιοι δοῦλοι, οὐκέτι ἐνταῦθα λυσίτελεϊ τὸν ἐμὸν δοῦλον σὲ δεδιέναι ἐν δὲ τῇ Λακεδαιμονίᾳ ὁ ἐμὸς δοῦλος σὲ δέδοικεν ἂν δὲ δέδῃ ὁ σὸς δοῦλος ἐμέ, κινδυνεύσει κ.τ.λ.*, but there are several others where *ἐγώ* and *σύ* are used in a similar way. The point is that, though the verb in the second person is used thus in Greek, e.g. the Homeric *φαίης κεν*, yet *σύ* is not employed with it. So in this very treatise 2, 5 *οἷόν τ' ἀποπλεῦσαι ἀπὸ τῆς σφετέρως αὐτῶν ὅπως βούλει πλοῦν*, unless we are to read *βούλονται* with Cobet. *Ἐγώ* is also used in an uncommon way in these passages and in 2, 12. On the other hand, if we are to take *ἐγώ* and *σύ* as real persons or as persons in a dialogue, we are involved in difficulties. Here in 1, 11 they will both be Spartans, for the author is clearly speaking of the natives of a place and the slaves of natives, not of visitors and their slaves. Yet in 1, 10, when he says of Athens *οὔτε πατάσαι (τὸν δοῦλον)*

ἔξεστιν αὐτόθι οὔτε ὑπεκοτῆσεται σοι ὁ δοῦλος, σοι appears to mean an Athenian gentleman, for it is he, not a stranger, whose liberty and privileges are thus curtailed. There would be no point in it, if he were not speaking of natives. Again in 2, 11 and 12 καὶ δὴ νῆες μοί εἰσι, and ἐγὼ μὲν... ταῦτα ἔχω διὰ τὴν θάλατταν, the speaker either is, or for the sake of argument supposes himself to be, an Athenian. These passages seem inconsistent with Cobet's view that the pronouns must refer to some one person respectively, either real or endowed in a dialogue with an imaginary but fixed personality. Such a person could not be both Spartan and Athenian. They seem to me also inconsistent with the view of Roscher and others (mentioned in Sauppe's preface) that the *R.A.* is a letter from an Athenian to a Spartan. The use of ἐγὼ and σύ, though rare, is not unique. Blass in his *Attische Beredsamkeit*, i. p. 276, quotes from the *De Anima*, 3, 2, 426 b 19, καὶ εἰ τοῦ μὲν ἐγὼ, τοῦ δὲ σὺ αἰσθαιοῖο: and cf. the οἷς ἂν ἐγὼ ληφθεῖν of Dem. 9, 17 cited in this *Review*, x. 381. Another example may possibly be found at the beginning of the extract from Teles, περὶ αὐταρκείας given in Stobaeus, *Flor.* 5, 67, σὺ μὲν ἀρχεὺς καλῶς ἐγὼ δὲ ἀρχομαι κ.τ.λ., but the parallel passage in the extract from the περὶ φύγης (*ib.* 40, 8) goes to show that the words, which are apparently quoted from Bion (see the *prolegomena* to Hense's *Teletis Reliquiae*, p. xxx.), are taken from a dialogue. In any case I hold it to be clear that in these passages of the *R.A.* both ἐγὼ and σύ are used as imaginary illustrations, and that therefore γῶ is a Spartan in 1, 11 and an Athenian in 2, 11-12 and σύ is both (1, 11 and 1, 10) in like manner. It should be noticed that in 3, 5 οὐκ οἶσθε seems an inevitable correction for οὐκ οἰσθαί, just as the MSS. have φοβεῖσθαι for φοβεῖσθε in the very similar place *Vect.* 4, 32, and that the plural must be addressed to imaginary readers or hearers.

Finally, what is the exact tone and spirit in which the author writes? I cannot think those critics (e.g. Mure, Thirlwall, Forbes in the introduction to his *Thucydides*, Book i., Blass, Müller-Strübing) understand him correctly, who talk of satire, banter, *persiflage*, irony. There seems to me to be nothing of the kind from beginning to end. There is a curiously cold, detached tone as of scientific or abstract politics, putting aside considerations of justice, passing over the question whether popular government and the well-being of the masses of the

people are right and proper things for the Athenians to aim at, and asking only whether the means are well adapted to the end in view. We are apt to call this Machiavellian. It is also Aristotelian, not to say Thucydidean. But no writer has adopted the tone with more complete composure than the writer of these few pages. The critics mistake his plain, frank, 'positive' way of putting things for satire: it is not satire, it is political science. If we take parts of the book for satire, there will be the most incongruous mixture of satire with plain unsatirical reasoning. Observe for instance that in 1, 18-19 the account of one reason why the allies are made to come to Athens for their law is instantly followed by a perfectly matter-of-fact and grave statement of an advantage the Athenians derive from possessions and empire over the sea. If we had the first by itself, the statement of how the allies are taught to respect not only the sovereign people but every individual who is part of it, a statement highly suggestive of the *Wasps* of Aristophanes and even thought to be borrowed from it, there would be some plausibility in taking it for satire. But there immediately follows another statement, that by going constantly to and fro between Athens and their private properties or public dependencies across the water the Athenians are always insensibly learning seamanship. This is not a joke, and no humourist would have added it to something he meant for satire. Swift and Defoe do not mix satire and common sense in this particular way. Their satire is all of a piece. If there is any satire in what the author of the *R.A.* says, it is in the facts stated and not in the mind of the writer. He says explicitly, 'I don't approve of the end they aim at, the form of government they adopt: but I should like to convince you that, given that, their system is a very rational and effective one.' He is putting himself with rare impersonality at their point of view: he is not caricaturing it at all. It is Aristotle, not Aristophanes, we must compare him with.

The particular passages of the *R.A.* on which I have any comments to make are very few in number. It is still full of imperfections and uncertainties, but they seem now to be mostly of that kind in which it is easy enough to see what a writer may have said but impossible to be certain what he did say. It is not a question of correcting or inserting a single word, but of putting right whole sentences. Kirchhoff's third

edition (Berlin, 1889) has gone at least as far in this direction as a prudent editor can go.

Since writing the following remarks, I have made acquaintance with the dissertation and text, accompanied by critical notes, published in *Philologus* Suppl. iv. by Müller-Strübing. He has anticipated me in two or three suggested readings.

1, 1. ὡς εὖ διασφύζονται τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τὰλλα διαπράττονται ἃ δοκοῦσιν ἀμαρτάνειν τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλήσι.

Kirchhoff follows Cobet in adding τε after διασφύζονται. Perhaps we should rather add γνώμη before διαπράττονται. Cf. 3, 10. δοκοῦσι δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ὀρθῶς βουλεύεσθαι . . . οἱ δὲ τοῦτο γνώμη ποιοῦσιν: and 1, 11. So K. has proposed to insert γνώμη before οὗτω καθίστηκε in 2, 1.

1, 3. οὔτε τῶν στρατηγικῶν κλήρων οἴονται σφισι χρῆναι μετεῖναι οὔτε τῶν ἱππαρχῶν. Κλήρων should, I think, be κλήρω. Cf. the words just before: πᾶσι τῶν ἀρχῶν μετεῖναι ἐν τε τῇ κλήρῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ χειροτονίᾳ. Probably K. is right in adopting Cobet's στρατηγιῶν, but why should κλήρων be omitted together?

1, 5. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς βελτίστοις . . . ἐν δὲ τῷ δήμῳ κ.τ.λ.

Probably ἐν < μὲν > γάρ.

1, 6. εἰ μὲν γὰρ οἱ χρηστοὶ ἔλεγον καὶ ἐβούλεον.

Μόνοι seems to be wanted with οἱ χρηστοί. (So Müller-Strübing).

1, 14. περὶ δὲ τῶν συμμάχων, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

There is no construction for ὅτι, which Dindorf therefore brackets. Read < ἐρῶ > ὅτι, as in 1, 2 πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοῦτο ἐρῶ, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

Ibid. συκοφαντοῦσι . . . καὶ μισοῦσι τοὺς χρηστούς.

Μισοῦσι has been doubted but is confirmed by 2, 19 τοὺς δὲ χρηστοὺς μισοῦσι μᾶλλον.

2, 2. τοῖς μὲν κατὰ γῆν ἀρχομένοις οἷόν τ' ἐστὶν ἐκ μικρῶν πόλεων συνοικισθέντας ἀθρόους μάχεσθαι.

Συνοικισθέντας seems to be entirely misused here and must, I think, be wrong. Should we read συναλισθέντας? (συναλισθέντας or συναθροισθέντας, Müller-Strübing).

2, 3. αἱ μὲν μεγάλαι (πόλεις) διὰ δέος ἀρχονται, αἱ δὲ μικραὶ πάνυ (Cobet adds καὶ) διὰ χρείαν.

K. suggests making δέος and χρείαν change places. In the principle of this I concur, for fear is much more applicable to small cities and convenience to large ones. But I would rather get the right meaning by exchanging the places of μεγάλαι and μικραὶ. It seems more natural to take the small places first. Πάνυ too goes better with μεγάλαι.

2, 7. τρόπους εὐωχῶν ἐξηῆρον.

Do we not seem to want < πολλοὺς > τρόπους, or something like it?

2, 11. τὸν δὲ πλοῦτον μόνον οἰοί τ' εἶσιν ἔχειν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων.

This statement seems too unqualified to be right, but I do not distinctly see what limitation should be put upon it.

2, 12. ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδὲν ποῖον ἐκ τῆς γῆς πάντα ταῦτα ἔχω διὰ τὴν θάλατταν.

There is no need to follow Schneider in reading ποῖων and so leaving ἐκ τῆς γῆς with no proper construction. Cf. Ar. *Peace* 1322 κριθὰς ποιεῖν: Dem. 42, 20 ποιῆς σίτου μὲν μεδίμνους πλέον ἢ χιλίους, οἶνον δὲ κ.τ.λ.: [Aristot.] Ἀθ. Πολ. 7, 4 ποιῇ πεντακῶσια μέτρα . . . ξηρὰ καὶ ὑγρά.

2, 15. πρὸς δὲ τοῖτοις καὶ ἐτέρου δέους ἀπηλλαγμένοι ἀν' ἦσαν, εἰνῆσον ὥκουν, μηδέποτε προδοθῆναι τὴν πόλιν κ.τ.λ.

It is just possible that μηδέποτε προδοθῆναι may be explained as a very loose construction after δέους ἀπηλλαγμένοι, as though those words = πιστεύοντες: but such a construction is so out of keeping with the simple and exact grammar of this book that I should rather suppose some participle like πιστεύοντες to have been lost. Προδοθῆναι seems in any case to require an ἄν.

2, 20. ὅστις δὲ μὴ ὦν τοῦ δήμου εἴλετο ἐν δημοκρατονμένῃ πόλει οἰκεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν ὀλιγαρχουμένῃ ἀδικεῖν παρσκευάσατο.

Why does Prof. Mahaffy think this sentence aimed at Alcibiades? Was he the only man μὴ ὦν τοῦ δήμου who lived at Athens? If it refers, as probably it does, to politicians, why should it not refer to Pericles himself? But, as a matter of fact, it is perfectly general. Perhaps it may be worth while to point out how completely for once the writer has allowed his *animus* to get the better of his usual cool judgment, writing as though it was entirely optional with a man where he would live, and the easiest thing in the world for an Athenian aristocrat to migrate somewhere else. Cf. however, Plato, *Crito* 52 E.

3, 1. καὶ τοῦτο Ἀθήνησι γίγνεται κ.τ.λ.

Logic seems rather to require καὶ < τοι >.

3, 2. δεῖ ἐορτάσαι ἐορτὰς ὅσας οὐδεμία τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων.

If in 2, 8 Kirchhoff writes οἱ < ἄλλοι > Ἑλλήνες, he ought to write here οὐδεμία < ἄλλη >. So in 1, 1 and repeatedly in the *R.L.* But it is probably unnecessary in either place. See the *Indices* to Demosthenes (Blass-Rehdantz) s.v. Ἑλλάς.

3, 6. ὡς οὐδὲ νῦν δι' ἐνιαυτοῦ δικάζοντες ἐπάρχουσιν ὥστε παύειν τοὺς ἀδικούντας.

The old emendation ἐπαρκοῦσιν, which

Kirchhoff and other recent editors adopt, gives the right meaning, but should probably give place to ἀπαρκῶσιν. The only known place where ἐπαρκεῖν seemed to mean 'suffice' was the line of Solon, δῆμῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκα τόσον κράτος, ὅσον ἐπαρκεῖ, and there Coray's conjecture of ἀπαρκεῖ has been confirmed by the papyrus of [Aristotle's] Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία. If ἀπαρκῶσιν, and not the simple ἀρκῶσιν, should be read here, it will be another instance of a distinctly old word.

3, 12. Ὑπολάβοι δέ τις ἂν ὡς οὐδεὶς ἄρα ἀδίκως ἡτῶνται Ἀθηῆνσι.

Cobet was surely right, though K. seems not to follow him, in saying that οὐδεὶς ἄρα κ.τ.λ. must be a question, and understanding ὑπολάβοι of an objection or rejoinder. Cobet omitted ὡς. Should we turn it into ἴσως?

All critics have found a want of connection between the last two sections of the book and what precedes. I should say the same of the last sentence of 1, 13 and of the whole of 2, 13. In ch. 3, the fourth section and the first half of the eighth, seem to break the sequence. Except in these places, the writing is fairly consecutive, and on this point Rettig seems more right than Kirchhoff, who finds all manner of *lacunae* and imperfections of order. But Rettig hardly succeeds in showing that 3, 12-13 would be in place after 1, 3. There seems nothing in 1, 2-3 to lead up to the ὑπολάβοι κ.τ.λ. of 3, 12.

RESPUBLICA LACEDAEMONIORUM.

1, 1. Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐννοήσας ποτέ κ.τ.λ.

The abrupt Xn. beginning should be noticed. He likes beginning as though he were continuing. Compare particularly the first words of the *Symposium*, Ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ κ.τ.λ. (The *R.A.* has a δέ at its beginning, like the *Oeconomicus*, *Apologia*, and *Hellenics*.)

1, 4. οὕτω καὶ ταῖς θηλείαις ἀγῶνας πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐποίησε, νομίζων ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἰσχυρῶν καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα ἐρρωμενέστερα γίνεσθαι.

Comparison of 2, 3-6 and other places makes it pretty certain that Cobet is right in adding ἂν to go with γίνεσθαι. Probably we should write καὶ for καί, but ἂν may be inserted elsewhere. There are two other passages in the book where ἂν seems to have been lost. In 4, 1 νομίζων τούτους, εἰ γένοιτο οἷους δέ, πλεῖστον ῥέπειν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τῇ πόλει, it is again probable, though not necessary, that ἂν should be added after

πλεῖστον. In 8, 5 ἐπῆρετο τὸν θεὸν εἰ λῶν καὶ ἄμεινον εἴη τῇ Σπάρτῃ πειθομένη οἷς αὐτὸς ἔθηκε νόμοις, ἂν seems certainly required with εἴη, because the thing is still future and hypothetical. In the parallel passage, *De Vectigalibus* 6, 2 ἐπερῆσθαι τοὺς θεοὺς εἰ λῶν καὶ ἄμεινον εἴη ἂν τῇ πόλει οὕτω κατασκευαζομένη, Schneider and Dindorf can hardly be right in omitting ἂν. *Anab.* 3, 1, 7 and 6, 2, 15 are somewhat different. It is one thing to say πότερον λῶν ἐστὶ πορεύεσθαι ἢ μένειν; another to say πότερον λῶν ἐστὶ (for ἔσται or εἴη ἂν) πειθομένη; and the latter seems to me wrong, for λῶν ἐστὶ πειθομένη implies actual obedience in present time. See, however, Goodwin 901 and 903, 7.

1, 6. καὶ τοῦτο συμφέρον τῇ εὐγονίᾳ νομίζων.

Probably συμφέρειν.

1, 7. τάναντία καὶ τούτου ἐνόμισε τῷ γὰρ πρεσβύτῃ ἐποίησεν, ὅποιον ἀνδρὸς σῶμά τε καὶ ψυχὴν ἀγασθεῖν, τοῦτον ἐπαγομένῳ τεκνοποιήσασθαι.

Νομίζω in the sense of νομοθεῖω recurs in 2, 4 ἐνόμισεν ἐν ἱματίῳ δι' ἔτους προσεθίζεσθαι, and again in 12, 3 ἐνόμισεν ὑπὸ Σκιριτῶν προφυλάττεσθαι. It is of course common enough as used of a number of people among whom some practice or belief exists, but as applied to a single person who enacts and establishes a practice it is not recognised in the lexicons nor perhaps to be found elsewhere in Greek of a good age. The editors however do not comment upon it, nor have I seen it pointed out by Dindorf or any one else as a peculiarity of the *R.L.* We might be disposed to doubt its correctness, but it seems sufficiently guaranteed not only by its triple use in this treatise, but by what we find in later Greek. In the *Lex. Seguer.* (Bekker's *Anecdota*, 1, p. 158) we read νομίζω νομοθεῖω, αἰτιατικῇ. Δίων πρῶτῳ βιβλίῳ 'ταῦτά τε οὖν ὁ Νουμῆς ἐνόμισεν.' And we have in Dio C. 37, 20 τοῖς ὑπ' ἐκείνου νομισθεῖσι, and 78, 22 τὰ νομισθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Μάρκου, both in the same sense. It is certainly remarkable that the *R.L.*, which also uses νομοθεῖω (5, 1 : 10, 1), should have νομίζω three times in this sense and that it should apparently not occur elsewhere in good Greek.

With ἐποίησεν we should expect τὸν πρεσβύτην, not τῷ πρεσβύτῃ. Cf. 6, 1 ἐποίησε παῖδων ἑκάστον ἀρχεῖν. Stephanus was perhaps right in wishing to insert νόμον or νόμῳ. We have νόμον ἐποίησεν...τεκνοποιεῖσθαι a few lines later and in 4, 7 τοῖς τηλικούτοις νόμῳ ἐποίησε κ.τ.λ. It seems barely possible to understand such a word out of ἐνόμισε. Cf. however such passages as in poetry *Il.*

23, 579 εἰ δ' αὖ' ἐγὼν αὐτὸς δικάσω, καὶ μ' οὐ τινα φημι ἄλλον ἐπιπλήξειν Δαναῶν· ἰδέα γὰρ ἔσται (where *δίκη* is understood from *δικάσω*), and in prose Herod. 2, 65 ἡ Αἴγυπτος... οὐ μάλ' ἀθηριώδης ἐστὶ· τὰ δὲ ἐόντα σφι (i.e. *θηρία*), ἅπαντα ἱρὰ νενόμισται: and see Kühner § 352 d.

2, 3. It is hard to believe that ὀρθιάδε βαίνειν can be right, the more so as the simple βαίνειν is extremely rare in Attic prose. (Cf. however, *De Re Eq.* 1, 3 ὁμοίως βαίνουσι.) Stobaeus has ὀρθα ἐκβαίνειν, but ἀναβαίνειν is the word we seem to want.

2, 12. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ παντάσῃ τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι τοὺς ἐραστὰς ἐργουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν παίδων.

Should τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι be omitted? It has no construction and may have been added in explanation of ἐργουσιν.

2, 14. It seems clear that the end of Ch. 2 and the end of Ch. 3 should change places, as Weiske pointed out: but the error is a very odd one. Editors have read παιδίσκων for παιδικῶν in 3, 5 as though young men who were ἐκ παίδων ἐκβεβηκότες (3, 1) could be called παιδίσκοι. But in 4, 6 the παιδονόμος is still more inappropriate as X. is now speaking of οἱ ἡβώντες. Whom are we to put in his place?

5, 3. οὔτε ἐρημός ποτε ἡ τράπεζα βρωτῶν γίγνεται, ἔστ' ἂν διασκορπῶσι.

The meaning is 'until the party breaks up.' Read therefore διασκορνήσωσι. The present tense would mean 'while it is breaking up.'

5, 5. Elsewhere persons of the same age sit together: ὁ δὲ Λυκούργος ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ ἀνέμιξε παιδεύεσθαι τὰ πολλὰ τοὺς νεωτέρους ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν γεραιτέρων ἐμπειρίας.

Ἀπέδειξε and ἐνόμισε have been suggested for ἀνέμιξε, but the latter is much too suitable a word to be wrong. Cobet thinks 'complura exciderunt.' Will it not be enough to read ἀνέμιξε, <βουλόμενος> παιδεύεσθαι, or <ὥς>?

6, 1. ἐποίησε παίδων ἕκαστον ὁμοίως τῶν ἐαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἄρχειν ὅταν δέ τις εἰδῇ ὅτι οὗτοι πατέρες εἰσὶ τῶν παίδων ὧν αὐτὸς ἄρχει, ἀνάγκη οὕτως ἄρχειν ὥσπερ ἂν καὶ τῶν ἐαυτοῦ ἄρχεσθαι βούλοιο.

Editors have found it difficult to see the meaning of οὗτοι. Perhaps Xenophon wrote <τοσ> οὗτοι. He must rule justly, because there are so many fathers to retaliate on his own children if he does not.

6, 4. ἀνοίξαντας τὰ σήμαντρα λαβόντας ὅσων ἂν δέωνται σημηναμένους καταλιπεῖν.

We seem to want 'reseat,' ἀνασημηναμένους, αὐθις σημηναμένους, or an equivalent.

8, 3. ὅσῳ γὰρ μείζω δύναμιν ἔχει ἡ ἀρχή, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ἡγήσαντο αὐτὴν καὶ καταπλήξαι τοὺς πολίτας.

I think ἔχει should in any case be ἔχοι. But according to Sauppe *libri tantum non omnes habent* ἂν before ἡγήσα<ν>το. Perhaps therefore we should read ἔχοι and μᾶλλον ἂν ἡγήσαντο . . καταπλήξαι, which will be a more regular sequence.

8, 4. Read <οἱ> ἐφοροῖ οἶν.

10, 2. θεῖς γὰρ τοὺς γέροντας κυρίους τοῦ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγῶνος κ.τ.λ.

There certainly seems to be some strange confusion either in the text or in the writer's mind. It is practically impossible that ὁ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγὼν can have here any but its ordinary meaning, which it has also in 8, 4 (περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς ἀγῶνα καταστήσας), of trial for life. Aristotle also (*Pol.* 3, 1 1275b 10) says οἱ γέροντες τὰς φονικὰς (δικὰς δικάζουσι). Yet the writer immediately goes on to remarks about ψυχῶν ἀγαθῶν κρίσις, and οἱ ἀγῶνες οἱ τῶν ψυχῶν as compared with οἱ τῶν σωματίων, which refer to the election of the Gerontes, as though these words (θεῖς γὰρ κ.τ.λ.) referred to the same thing. The well-known statement in Plutarch, *Lycurg.* 26, about the election of the Gerontes seems inconsistent with any such interpretation, even if it were the natural one.

11, 2. Something seems missing here that would explain the words οὕτω γὰρ ἦκιστ' ἂν τὸ ἐκλείπον διαλάβοι. They can hardly be justified by the bare fact that some stores were carried in waggons and some by beasts of burden.

11, 3. Lycurgus ordered the troops στολὴν μὲν ἔχειν φοινικίδα καὶ χαλκὴν ἀσπίδα, ταύτην νομίζων ἦκιστα μὲν γυναικεία κοινωνεῖν, πολεμικωτάτην δ' εἶναι καὶ γὰρ τάχιστα λαμπρύνεται καὶ σχολαιότατα ῥυπαίνεται. ἐφῆκε δὲ καὶ κομᾶν κ.τ.λ.

Ταύτην should refer to στολὴν and καὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. to χαλκὴν ἀσπίδα (cf. 13, 8), but with the present order of words this is impossible. It would be secured, if we might transfer καὶ χαλκὴν ἀσπίδα from its present place to follow εἶναι. Possibly λαμπρύνεται and ῥυπαίνεται should be infinitives.

H. RICHARDS.

OVID'S *HEROIDES*.

(Continued from p. 204.)

IX 7-10.

Hoc uelit Eurystheus, uelit hoc germana
Tonantis

laetaque sit uitae labe nouerca tuae;
at non ille uenis, cui nox, si creditur,
una
non tanti, ut tantus conciperere, fuit.

uenis in 9, which has no tolerable sense, is given by P and G and the overwhelming majority of other MSS. Three or four have *uelit*, which Heinsius and all modern editors adopt. *βροτοῖσιν οὐδὲν ἔσθ' ἀπόμορον*, but it is improbable almost to the last degree that any scribe would alter *uelit* into *uenis* here, with *ille* standing close by to protect the 3rd pers., and two other *uelit*'s hovering like guardian angels overhead.

The sentence 'cui nox una non tanti fuit, ut tantus conciperere' is the purest nonsense, and editors who deliberately retain it are merely professing their ignorance of what the Latin phrase 'non tanti fuit' means. 'Nam, si priore significatione uti uelis, quid hoc est, noluisse Iouem unam noctem accipere ea condicione, ut tantus fieret Hercules? sin altera, non minus absurdum erit, noluisse Iouem unam noctem subire, ut Hercules tantus efficeretur. praeterea utraque ratione Iuppiter dicitur noluisse Herculem magnum fieri, cum sententia poetae sit, uoluisse' Madvig opusc. ii 194. Therefore some write with a few MSS 'non tanta'; but the change by a copyist of *tanta* to *tanti* in this context is as nearly impossible as the change of one letter can ever be; and *tanta* after all will only mean 'tam longa', while it appears to me that the sense demands 'sat longa'. So Bentley seems to have thought, for he adopted from a few other MSS the conjecture 'non satis': I do not know that this is more violent than *tanta*, but violent it certainly is. Here then in a couple of verses are a couple of very unlikely alterations: we must try another road.

An expedient which may at first sight look attractive is this: to keep the pentameter unaltered and import into the hexameter some noun meaning *spatii* or *ambitus* to agree with *tanti* as a genitive of quality: 'cui nox una non tanti ambitus fuit, ut tantus conciperere'. To write *orbis* for

uenis would be rough and unsatisfactory: a more plausible change would be to expel *ille uenis* as a stopgap for a lost word and write 'at non, <circuitus> cui' cet., supposing *circuitus* to have fallen out because of *cui*. But this incurs the same objection as *tanta*, that the sense will require not *tanti* or 'tam longi' but 'sat longi'; and I only make the suggestion in order to deter anyone else from making it.

There is another way which I think much better. Alter *uenis* (*u=b* and *n=u*) into *breuis*, and non *tanti* into a dative participle with the meaning of *laboranti*:

at non ille, breuis cui nox, si creditur,
una
luctanti, ut tantus conciperere, fuit.

If the initial *l* succumbed to one of the many perils of the margin, the neighbourhood of *tantus* would naturally detach *tanti* and cause it to be taken for a separate word; and the change of the remnant *uc* into *nō* would be almost as easy as the similar change of the abbreviations *nc* and *u'o* which so often turns *nunc* and *vero* into *non*. *luctanti* is specially appropriate as being a uox amatoria, Prop. ii 1 13 and 15 5.

IX 43-46.

Mater abest queriturque deo placuisse
potenti,
nec pater Amphitryon nec puer
Hyllus adest.
arbiter Eurystheus irae Iunonis iniquae
sentitur nobis iraque longa deae.

The words 'arbiter irae' are doubtless capable of meaning what the editors take them to mean, the dispenser of the wrath of Juno. But I am astonished that either Ovid or any respectable versifier should be supposed capable of writing 'arbiter irae Iunonis iraque longa deae'. And further there is both a general and a particular reason for expecting 'arbiter' to mean something quite different. When the wife of Hercules uses such words as 'arbiter Eurystheus sentitur nobis', the reference, but for the presence of 'irae', would naturally be to Eurystheus' lordship over

the seed of Jove, and 'arbiter' would signify 'arbiter domus nostrae'. And Ovid, though I do not find that the editors mention it, is here copying the language of Virgil Aen. viii 291 sqq. 'ut duros mille labores | *rege sub Eurystheo fatis Iunonis iniquae* | pertulerit'. I believe then that 'arbiter' in Ovid has the same sense as 'rege' in Virgil, and that 'irae', which prevents 'arbiter' from having that sense, has usurped the place of an ablative explaining how Eurystheus came by his sovereignty. That ablative was not *fatīs*, which is much too vague and Virgilian for Ovid, and would not have been lost: several words are possible, but the following seems the most apt and likely:

arbiter Eurystheus <astu> Iunonis
iniquae
sentitur nobis iraque longa deae.

In *eurysthe-us-as-tu-iu-nonis* the cause of the omission is plain: then *irae* was supplied from below. The reference of course is to Juno's famous trick narrated in Hom. Il. T 95-125: see 96 sq. καὶ τὸν | Ἥρη θῆλυς ἐοῦσα δολοφροσίνης ἀπάτησε, 106 τὸν δὲ δολοφρονέουσα προσηῖδα πότνια Ἥρη, 112 Ζεὺς δ' οὐ τι δολοφροσίνην ἐνόησε. It may be worth mentioning that Ovid in his account of the retarded birth of Hercules at met. ix 285 sqq. has 'Iunoni iniquae' 296 and 'iniqua Iunone' 308 sq. Perhaps *furto* is almost equally probable.

IX 131-134.

Forsitan et pulsa Aetolide Deianira
nomine deposito paelicis uxor erit,
Eurytidosque Ioles et insanii Alcidae
turpia famosus foedera iunget
Hymen.

133 *et insanii* P, *atque insani* G and most MSS. This latter is an undisguised interpolation in aid of metre and accident; and *insani* is at once so inept and so disgusting that there is no need to consider it. Bentley suggested *atque Inachii* or *atque Aonii*; but these are based on the falsified text of G. A much more probable conjecture would be *et Sidonii* (=Thebani), if this were not discountenanced by 101 sq. 'haec tu Sidonio (=Tyrio) potes insignitus amictu | dicere? non cultu lingua retenta silet?' and if you did not expect a patronymic to match 'Eurytidos'. I think however that *Sidonii* after all may have something to do with the present state of the text. If the MS

reading were once upon a time *et ionii*, then *sidonii* would be a natural conjecture to restore the sense and metre, and the correction *ionii*, by the confusion of *d* with *a*, might easily engender *insanii*. But *et ionii* would stand for *et et-ionii*, that is

Eurytidosque Ioles et Echionii Alcidae.

For a similar loss see trist. i 10 13 *uastis et* for *uasti secet*. Hercules was sixth in descent from Echion: Hipponome the mother of Amphitryon was the daughter of Menoeceus the grandson of Pentheus.

IX 153-158.

Heu deuota domus! solio sedet Agrios
alto;
Oenea desertum nuda senecta premit;
exulat ignotis Tydeus germanus in oris; 155
alter fatali uiuus in igne fuit;
exegit ferrum sua per praecordia mater:
impia quid dubitas Deianira mori?

156. 'Latet mendum in hoc uersu.....an *fatali uiuus in igne perit?*' Heinsius; and Bentley too adopts *perit*: Francius with more external probability proposes *cinis*, which hardly gives a just meaning. *fuit* however is quite intolerable: write

alter fatali uiuus in igne *situs*.

If you suppose the last letter to have been lost, the remnant *situ* hardly differs from *fuit* in appearance: the difference between *fuit* and *situs* in point of diction is more considerable.

X 29-32.

Inde ego, nam uentis quoque sum crudelibus usa,
uidi praecipiti carbasa tenta noto.
aut uidi aut tamquam quae me uidisse
putarem
frigidior glacie semianimis fui.

In 31 *putarem* is given by P, by V (frag. Vindob. saec. xii), and by other MSS; *putavi* by G and others. *tamquam* is given by G, *fuerant* by V and others: some have *etiam*, but those appear also to have *cum* instead of *quae* and to be interpolated; and I only mention them because the second hand of P is among them, and proves, by writing *etiam*, that *etiam* was not in P.

What was in P is doubtful: Merkel says that it seems to have the same as G, *aut tamquam*, under an erasure; but the later editors Messrs Sedlmayer and Palmer represent it as giving *a///uam*, and Mr Sedlmayer adds that after *a* the remains of *ut* are discernible; and the dimensions of the gap as depicted by him and Mr Palmer will not hold more than one or at most two letters beside those two.

About the required meaning of 31 *sq.* the editors seem to be quite unanimous. Some of them fancy that the words possess it already, others know that they do not and try to confer it upon them by conjectures and fail, others try again and succeed; but the same meaning, that given for instance by Madvig's '*aut uidi aut tantum quia me uidisse putauit* | *frigidior glacie semianimisque fui*', is the meaning sought or found by all. Very well then: throw all their explanations and all their emendations into the fire: they are vitiated through and through by an utter misconception of what Ovid is saying. It most unluckily happens that there are two passages which have a strong verbal likeness to this: xviii (Leander) 31 *sq.* '*lumina quin etiam summa uigilantia turre* | *aut uidet aut acies nostra uidere putat*' and Verg. Aen. vi 454 '*aut uidet aut uidisse putat per nubila lunam*': critics have been led astray by these delusive parallels and have fancied that because Ovid here uses or seems to use a similar vocabulary he is conveying a similar thought. But firstly, though it would be just and beautiful to make Ariadne say (like Catullus in 64 55 '*necdum etiam sese quae uisit uisere credit*') that at her first glimpse of the flying sail she did not know whether it were real or imaginary, I cannot conceive anything much more silly and aimless than to make her say (as the editors do here) that at the time of writing this letter to Theseus she still does not know whether she really saw or only fancied that she saw the sail. And secondly, she proceeds to contradict this notion flatly. When you come to 43 *sqq.* you read '*iamque oculis ereptus eras. tum denique fleui*': | *torpuerant molles ante dolore genae*. | *quid potius facerent quam me mea lumina flerent*, | *postquam desierant uela uidere tua?*': so she did see the sail, and she knows that she saw it.

As to the meaning and the form of the sentence I feel no doubt at all, but the erasure of P and the divergency of the other MSS make the wording uncertain. It seems clear however that emendation must be based on the *tamquam* of G which

is supported against the other MSS by the *uam* of P. Therefore I conjecture

*ut uidi, haut dignam quae me uidisse
putarem,
frigidior glacie semianimisque fui.*

ut is Bentley's and J. F. Heusinger's: both *ut* and *haut* are eternally confused with *aut*. '*quae*' is acc. plur. neut.: the meaning is 'when I saw such a sight as methought I did not deserve to see'. Compare ii 61 '*sperauit melius, quia me meruisse putauit*', v 7 *sq.* '*leniter, ex merito quidquid patiare, ferendum est: quae uenit indigno poena, dolenda uenit*'.

The corruption would begin with the easy change of *gn* to *qu*, *dignam* to *di quam*: indeed [*di q*] *uam* itself, for aught I know, may be under the *///uam* of P; or perhaps in P *dignam* was corrupted to [*di*] *uam* by that frequent loss of *g* beside *n* which at xxi 216 has transformed *digna* to *bina*. I have also thought of '*ut uidi, indignam quae*' cet., *indi* being absorbed by *uidi* and leaving only *gnam* or *quam* for the scribes to spin into metre. The *etiam* of certain MSS, as I have said, appears to be interpolated and assuredly was not in P; so let no one conjecture *meritam*. The *fuertant* of V is also very suspicious and discountenanced by P; so I would not suggest *uerum*, i.e. *aequum* 'fair'.

But if you like to assume that another word in the verse is corrupt it will be possible to follow the *aut tamquam* of G very closely indeed:

*ut uidi, haut imquam quae me meruisse
putarem,*

or perhaps *hautquaquam* (Verg. georg. iv 455 '*hautquaquam ob meritum*', where by the way one MS has *aut quamquam* as again at Aen. xii 45). The loss of *me-* after *me* and the expansion of *-ruisse* to *uidisse* are corruptions of which I shall elsewhere give several examples but here only one: vii 55 where Mr. Palmer emends '*urbe uirum iuuu*': *iu* was absorbed by *ui* or *m*, and *ui* was expanded to *uidi* which stands in the MSS. Then for the sense and language compare ii 61 already cited '*sperauit melius quia me meruisse putauit*'.

X 67-75.

Non ego te, Crete centum digesta per
urbes,
aspiciam, puero cognita terra Ioui,

*ut pater et tellus iusto regnata parenti
prodita sunt facto, nomina cara, meo. 70
cum tibi, ne uictor tecto morerere
recuruo,
quae regerent passus, pro duce fila
dedi,
tum mihi dicebas 'per ego ipsa pericula
iuro
te fore, dum nostrum uiuet uterque,
meam'.
uiuimus, et non sum, Theseu, tua. 75*

Thus should this passage be written and punctuated. The full stop at the end of 70 instead of the usual comma, and the *tum* (from a few MSS) in 73 instead of the usual *cum*, are due to Bentley: these alterations are made in order that the important point contained in 75 may be introduced in a workmanlike and not in a bungling manner. What I have done is to put a comma at the end of 68 instead of the usual full stop, and to write *ut* (= *ex quo tempore*) in 69 instead of *at*. *at* has no meaning in this place and was altered by Heinsius and Bentley with some MSS to *nam*: the modern editors (except that Mr Ehwald proposes *a*) retain it, because one conjunction is much the same as another.

X 83-86.

*Iam iam uenturos aut hac aut suspicor
illac,
qui lanient auido uiscera dente, lupos.
forsitan et fuluos tellus alat ista leones. 85
quis scit an et saeuas tigridas insula
habet?*

85 *alat* P, *alit* G et plerique.86 *et saeuas*] *et haec* P, *haec saeuas* G et alii, *hec etiam* V.*tigridas* G et alii, *tigrides* (*trigides*) P, V, alii.*habet*] *habent* P, sed corr.

I do not think that I can emend verse 86, but I think that I can remove one obstacle to its emendation. The conjectures hitherto proposed either retain '*quis scit an...habet*' and are solecistic, or alter it and are violent. The best attempt yet made to correct the grammar is Wakker's, who transposes *habet* with the *alat* of 85. But a much easier transposition will achieve the desired result. Suppose the couplet once stood thus:

*quis scit an et fuluos tellus alat ista
leones?
forsitan et saeuas tigridas insula
habet.*

It will be seen that *itanet* occurs in the first verse immediately above *itanet* in the second. I suggest then that the scribe at that point wandered from the hexameter into the pentameter and wrote

*quis scit an et | saeuas tigridas insula
habet...*

then saw what he had done, and added the lacking members

*forsitan et | fuluos tellus alat ista
leones...*

and then appended marks of transposition. But the next scribe, finding a pentameter before an hexameter, concluded that he was to transpose these; and accordingly produced our present text.

I only profess to have mended the grammar: there is much more to mend. *saeuas* is very uncertain, and the elision *insula habet* is not to be defended by *resistere equos* penned at Tomi and taken straight from Propertius. I make no further proposal of my own, but I will say that the best among the various conjectures, now that it will no longer be solecistic, seems to me to be Gronovius' *saeuam tigrida Naxos habet*.

X 145, 146.

*Has tibi plangendo lugubria pectora
lassas
infelix tendo trans freta longa manus.*

These two lines and the two which follow them are properly expelled by Bentley as spurious; but still one need not be too proud to emend them. *longa* in the pentameter is omitted by P, which probably means that the original ran

infelix tendo trans freta lata manus.

The scribe glanced from *ta* to *ta*: at ii 122 '*aequora lata*' a similar error has caused *lata* to be lost and supplanted by *nota* in G. '*freta lata*' is found at met. xi 749: '*freta longa*' is much commoner, her. vii 46, xiv 103, xvi 22, am. ii 11 5, met. vii 67, viii 142, fast. iii 868, v 660, and therefore likely to occur to a corrector.

XI 121-128.

*Tu tamen, o frustra miserae sperate
sorori,*

sparsa, precor, nati collige membra
tui,
et refer ad matrem socioque inpone
sepulchro,
unaque nos habeat quamlibet arta
duos.
uine memor nostri lacrimasque in uul-
nera funde 125
neue reformida corpus amantis
amans.
tu, rogo, dilectae nimium mandata
sororis
perfer: mandatis persequar ipsa
patris.

In the last distich the words *tu...perfer* can only be explained as addressed to a servant who is to carry Canace's letter to Macareus: 'do you convey' etc.: *perfer* means nothing else. But this is out of the question, and Hor. *serm.* i 10 92 and Prop. iii 23 23 *sq.* are no parallels at all: such an address cannot form a part of Canace's epistle. Nor indeed is *tu* intelligible without a vocative, when *tu* in 121 means Macareus. Then further, the words *mandatis persequar* are neither sense nor Latin: in G and many other MSS they are altered into *mandatis perfruar*, which is grammatical

but laughable: a few MSS try another road and write *mandatum persequar*, which is better but very bad: the singular *mandatum* after the plural *mandata* is most incompetent writing, and the corruption into *-is* of the acc. termination *-um* by the side of a transitive verb is nothing less than inexplicable. Heinsius accordingly judged the couplet spurious; but he despaired too soon.

To begin with, the first sentence is excellently emended in one MS, quoted by Heinsius himself, which alters *perfer* to *perfice*. The words are then addressed, as they should be, to Macareus, and make perfect sense: for the corruption compare xiii 122 where *refecta* has been changed to *referre*, and Livy xlv 28 10 there adduced by Madvig where *refici* has been changed to *referri*. I propose to complete the emendation thus:

tu, rogo, dilectae nimium mandata
sororis
perfice: mandatis *opsequar* ipsa
patris.

Some accident obliterated *o*, and *psequar* was mistaken for *psequar*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

(To be continued.)

OF TWO PASSAGES IN HOMER.

In commenting on Eurip. *Alc.* 64-69 I have called attention to the rhetorical inversion of cause and effect in these verses and also to the close parallel to be found in Aesch. *Prom.* 918-923,—a parallel that extends even to the expansion of the τοῖος sentence by a ὅς δὲ sentence. Of course, however, the postponement of the τοῖος clause is the essential common factor. In a note on *Alc.* 332 *sq.* the same principle of arrangement is appealed to in defence of the traditional text (barring ἄλλως in v. 333, which should perhaps be changed, with Wakefield, to ἄλλων). Here οὕτως with an adjective is equal to a specific τοῖος (τοία). This defence was, I still think (with all due respect to Mr. Hadley), sound. But it is not my object at present to discuss the instances of this form of sentence in the *Alcestis*, or in the Tragedians at large (cf., however, for Sophocles *Ai.* 560-563), but to deal with earlier examples of it.

A parallel to the first two passages cited above (*Alc.* 64-69, *Prom.* 918-923) is to be found in Hom. Δ 387-390:—

ἐνθ' οὐδὲ ξείνός περ ἰὼν ἱππηλάτα Τυδεΐς
τάρβει, μῦνος ἔων πολέσιν μετὰ Καδμείου-
σιν,
ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἀθλεῖνεν προκαλίζετο, πάντα δ'
ἐνίκα
ῖρηδῖος· τοίη οἱ ἐπύρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη·

The parallel would be complete in extenso, if the last verse were followed by a relative clause beginning with ἣ δὲ (e.g. ἣ δὲ οἱ μέγα θάρσος ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἐνῆκεν). With Δ 389-90 we may compare E 807-8, even if v. 808 be an interpolation. E 826-8 has the former sentence in the imperative, but the τοῖος clause is like (indeed, is nearly identical with) that in E 808 and that in Δ 390. (With E 826-8 we may compare Ξ 342 *sq.* and O 254.) In all these passages we have

a form of the qualitative τοῖος, and we may find another case, or rather, perhaps, an extension, of this at δ 227 (cf. Eur. *Med.* 718 and 789), if we lighten the pointing at the close of v. 226. Similar to this last is the use of the quantitative τόσος in ι 243. Other (and better) instances of forms of τόσος in the type of sentence we are considering are: ξ 326, τ 295, E 863, I 546. The demonstrative adverb οὕτω, without a following adjective, appears similarly used at ι 262. The absence of the adjective differentiates (though not essentially) this example from *Alc.* 332 sq.

We come now to the passage that prompted the writing of this note—A 418. According to the traditional text Thetis says to Achilles (v. 414 sqq.):—

ὦ μοι, τέκνον ἐμόν, τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ
τεκούσα;
αἰθ' ὄφελες παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀδάκρυτος καὶ
ἀπήμων 415
ῆσθαι, ἐπεὶ νῦ τοι αἶσα μίνυνθά περ, οὐ τι
μᾶλα δὴν,
νῦν δ' ἅμα τ' ὠκύμορος καὶ οἰζυρὸς περὶ
πάντων
ἔπλεο· τῷ (or τῶι) σε κακῇ αἴσῃ τέκον ἐν
μεγάρουσιν.

But 'therefore ill-starred did I bring thee forth in the hall' is not what we expect here, and I have for some time believed a slight change in the text (really only an interpretation of the MS. tradition) to be necessary. Write τῶς σε κακῇ αἴσῃ τέκον ἐν μεγάρουσιν, and we have an instance of the form of expression we have been discussing: 'So ill-starred did I bear thee in the hall' (= οὕτω σε κτέ.).

This seems to be the only case in Homer where τῶς has given place to τῷ (τῶι): but, if we examine the few passages in which τῶς appears (we may well think, with van Leeuwen, that it was once more frequent), we shall find one that should, it seems, by a trifling transposition be reduced to the type

of sentence we are dealing with. In τ 232 sqq. we read:—

τὸν δὲ χιτῶν' ἐνόησα περὶ χροὶ σιγαλόεντα,
οἶόν τε κρομύοιο λοπὸν κάτα ἰσχαλίοιο,
τῶς μὲν ἔην μαλακός, λαμπρὸς δ' ἦν ἥελιος
ὥς.
ἦ μὲν πολλαὶ γ' αὐτὸν ἐθήσαντο γυναῖκες. 235

Here the οἶον clause is explanatory of σιγαλόεντα. The τῶς sentence immediately following, with its μαλακός, which is not in point after ἰσχαλίοιο, and its λαμπρὸς ἥελιος ὥς, which makes a homely comparison ridiculous by contrast, is, furthermore, awkwardly and unusually connected with v. 235. We have only to reverse the order of vv. 234 and 235 (the present order is easily to be explained by a careless reader's ready connection of τῶς with οἶον and by the similar position of μὲν in the two verses) to have the arrangement that is normal in such sentences, as well as a greatly improved sense,—indeed, I would fain believe, the original form of the passage. Thus we shall read:—

τὸν δὲ χιτῶν' κτέ.
ἦ μὲν πολλαὶ γ' αὐτὸν ἐθήσαντο γυναῖκες· 235
τῶς μὲν ἔην μαλακός, λαμπρὸς δ' ἦν ἥελιος 234
ὥς.

There is a passage in Aeschylus (*Prom.* 907 sqq.) that belongs with those discussed above, and should be read thus:—

ἦ μὴν ἔτι Ζεὺς, καίπερ αὐθάδῃ φρονῶν,
ἔσται ταπεινός· τοῖον ἐξαρτύεται κτέ.

Faith in the text of the Mediceus has led scholars, since Hermann, to reject the vulgate for αὐθάδης φρενῶν in v. 907 (though that does not so much concern us now) and to cling to οἶον where τοῖον is clearly demanded, as Robortello long ago saw.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Bryn Mawr College.

NOTE ON OD. IV. 544-7.

ἀλλὰ τάχιστα
πείρα, ὅπως κεν δὴ σὴν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἴκηαι
ἦ γάρ μιν ζῶν γε κινήσεις, ἦ κ' ἐν Ὀρέστῃς
κτεῖνεν ἐν ὑποφθάμενος, σὺ δὲ κεν τάφον ἀντι-
βολήσῃς.

All MSS. and Herodian read ἦ κεν: in the next line the Medicean (G, saec. x.) has κτείνει, the Florentine (F, saec. xi.) has κτείνει, and the Palatine (P, 1201 A.D.) has κτάνει, corrected to κτείνειν by a later hand,

and to κτείνει by a still later (Molhuysen, De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis p. 50). Modern critics accept κτείνειν, but many read καὶ instead of κεν. But neither ἢ κεν...κτείνειν nor ἢ καὶ...κτ. is satisfactory, and we must either accept κτείνειν from G, or make the very slight alteration to κτείνει = κτείνῃ, 3. sg. aor. subj.

The words quoted are addressed by Proteus to Menelaus, who has to return to Egypt and there sacrifice, before he can set out on the homeward voyage to Argos. All this involves so much time, that if Aegisthus were already dead, Menelaus could not possibly arrive in time for the τάφος. Accordingly the translation of Butcher and Lang, 'or it may be Orestes was beforehand with thee and slew him', is objectionable in point of meaning, even if the meaning could be got out of the Greek. But it cannot, for ἢ κεν...κτείνειν can only mean 'or else O. would have slain him, but did not;' it can only give the supposed consequence of an unfulfilled condition. Monro, *H.G.*² p. 295, compares X 108-110:

ἔμοι δὲ τότ' ἂν πολλὸν κέρδιον εἴη
ἀντην ἢ Ἀχιλῆα κατακτείναντα νέεσθαι
ἢ κεν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι ἐκλεκτῶς πρὸ πόλλος.

But this is very different, for the infinitive is equivalent to a clause with εἰ and optative:—ἔμοι ἂν κέρδιον εἴη, ἢ εἰ Ἀχιλῆα κατα-

κτείνας νεοίμην, ἢ εἰ κεν (κεν emphasizes the alternative) αὐτὸς ὀλοίμην. For εἰ κεν with the optative we can find Homeric parallels, e.g. I 14 (cf. Monro, *H.G.*² p. 285), but none for κεν with the aorist indicative in the sense proposed.

Another interpretation makes a future perfect of the aorist with κεν, vide Merry *ad loc.* ('O. will have been his slayer'); which gives good sense, but bad grammar.

On the other hand ἢ καὶ...κτείνειν is good in grammar, but, for the reason stated, bad in sense. We must have a verbal form that refers to future time.

The readiest solution is presented by the aor. opt. κτείνειν in G: 'either you will find him alive, or Orestes might be beforehand with you and kill him, while you would come in for the funeral-feast.' But we can more easily explain the variations in the MS. reading, if we suppose that the original was κτείνει, 3rd sg. aor. subj., with -ει corresponding to -ομεν, -ετε in the plural of subjunctives from non-thematic indicatives: cf. Schulze, *Hermes* xx. 493 and *K.Z.* xxxiii. 134, and Stolz, *Ind. Forsch.* ii. 154. For the construction cf. A 431-3:

σήμερον ἢ δοιοῖσιν ἐπειξέαι Ἰππασίδῃσι

ἢ κεν ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυτὴς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσης.

C. M. MULVANY.

NOTE ON CICERO, *AD FAM.* 1, 2, 2 AND 1, 1, 2.

In the March number of the *Classical Review*, p. 108, Mr. Gretton has discussed some of the many difficulties involved in the information which has come down to us concerning the debates in the Roman senate early in the year 56 B.C., on the proposed restoration of Ptolemaeus Auletes to his kingdom. Mr. Gretton's remarks bear chiefly upon Cic. *Ad Fam.* 1, 2, 2: 'proxima erat Hortensi sententia, cum Lupus, tribunus plebis, quod ipse de Pompeio retulisset, intendere coepit ante se oportere discessionem facere quam consules. Eius orationi vehementer ab omnibus reclamatum est; erat enim et iniqua et noua. Consules neque concedebant neque ualde repugnabant, diem consumi uolebant, quod est factum; perspiciebant enim in Hortensi sententiam multis partibus pluris ituros, quamquam aperte Volcacio adsentirentur. Multi roga-

bantur, atque id ipsum consilibus inuitis, nam ei Bibuli sententiam ualere cupierunt.' In this passage the two most recent editors, Mendelssohn and C. F. W. Mueller, keep the reading of the MSS., *inuitis*, whereas most of their predecessors insert *non* before the word. Mr. Gretton also supports the traditional text but from a different point of view; they refer *ei* to the consuls, he to *multi*. I will discuss the former view first, but must begin by mentioning that the two editors follow Madvig in changing *cupierunt* to *cupierant*. No necessity exists for this alteration; Cicero may just as well have written that the consuls *did*, earlier in the debate, favour the rejected motion of Bibulus, as that they *had* favoured it. Apart from that matter, the lection of the *codices* gives a curious succession of considerations in the minds of the consuls: (1) they saw that the

motion of Hortensius would be carried, if the matter came to a division; (2) they therefore wished the sitting to pass without result; (3) though much time was wasted by asking for opinions, this waste of time did not make them happy, because the motion of Bibulus which they favoured had been rejected. To enumerate the succession of considerations is to condemn this interpretation of the passage. The consuls wanted to waste time, but they were sorry for the waste, because their favourite motion had just been rejected!

Mr. Gretton refers *ei* to *multi*; and rightly says that it is of some importance to make out the view which the two consuls, Lentulus Marcellinus and Marcus Philippus, took of the matter. But he makes no reference to a very important passage in the preceding letter, viz. *Fam.* 1, 1, 2: 'Marcellinum tibi esse iratum scis: is hac regia causa excepta ceteris in rebus acerrimum tui defensorem fore ostendit. Quod dat, accipimus: quod instituit referre de religione et saepe iam retulit, ab eo deduci non potest.' Putting aside for the present the question whether *tibi* in this passage is corrupt or not, we may fairly deduce from it two inferences, (1) that throughout the contest Marcellinus opposed the claims of Cicero's correspondent, Lentulus Spinther; (2) that in persistently pressing upon the attention of the senate what Cicero calls the *religionis calumnia*, he desired to injure the prospects, not only of Spinther, but of Pompeius also. The latter inference is confirmed by a passage in the preceding section of the letter; 'regis causa si qui sunt qui uelint, qui pauci sunt, omnes rem ad Pompeium deferri uolunt, senatus religionis calumniam non religione, sed maleuolentia et illius regiae largitionis inuidia comprobatur.' We may reasonably conclude that Marcellinus, at all events, (in his heart) cried a plague upon both houses, that of Spinther and that of Pompeius alike. He owed much to Pompeius, a fact of which Pompeius bitterly reminded him later in the year (*Plut. Pomp.* 51). He would be unwilling to oppose directly the friends of Pompeius in the senate, but would be glad to check the ambition of his former leader by indirect methods. These could lead to no open breach with Pompeius, because the triumvir himself was playing a double game. While his friends in the senate were pushing his claims, he was pretending, in conversation with Cicero, that he was devoted to the interests of Spinther. The majority in the senate were acting much in the same manner as Marcellinus; they were ready

to support by speech the motion of Volcaci, while determined, if a division were taken, to vote for that of Hortensius. As to the other consul, Marcus Philippus, there is nothing to show that he diverged from his colleague; the evidence is all the other way.

Mr. Gretton sees how difficult it is to refer *ei* to *multi* unless the latter word be restricted to the *consulares*, who mostly voted for the proposal of Bibulus which was lost. But the restriction is unnatural. As the very purpose of questioning the senators was to waste time, the questioning would obviously be pushed as far as possible. On the other hand if *multi* goes far beyond the *consulares* we have a most extraordinary change of front. Just before, in the very same sitting, the proposition of Bibulus had been rejected by a large majority (*frequentes ierunt in alia omnia*). Then, we are told, the consuls clearly saw (*perspiciebant*) that a large majority would be ready to speak for the motion of Volcaci, but would be sure to vote for that of Hortensius. Yet the *multi*, when asked for their opinion, spoke in favour of the already rejected motion! The insertion of *non* seems to educe order out of chaos. The fact that the consuls previously desired the resolution of Bibulus to pass was very good reason why they should now be glad to see time wasted. That resolution, leading up to *tris legatos ex eis qui priuati sunt* (*Fam.* 1, 1, 3) shut the door permanently against Spinther and Pompeius alike. The policy of delay was sure to shut the door against both, temporarily, and was likely to shut the door finally; and so matters indeed turned out. The reading *non inuitis* seems, further, to fit in very well with the fact that the demand for *sententiae* proceeded from the tribune in the first instance. In ordinary circumstances, the consuls would not care to be obliged to conduct the business of the house according to the views of a tribune. The words *id ipsum* seem also to be somewhat in favour of reading *non inuitis*; they appear most naturally to refer to the *perrogatio*, to the fact that many were called upon to speak (*trō rogari multos*). On the view of Mr. Gretton, they less naturally emphasize the contrast between the expectation which the consuls formed of the *perrogatio*, and its actual result. The circumstance that *non* is not in the MSS. has little weight if any. In his note, Mueller gives a number of examples of *non* omitted, and his list might be increased indefinitely.

Incidentally, it may be noted that the passage in *Fam.* 1, 2, 2 makes rather in

favour of the view put forward by Willems, and rejected by Mommsen, that the *relator* could stop the *perrogatio* at any point, and proceed to a division, could in fact enforce the closure of debate. The *relator* could certainly call for a division without debate. According to Mommsen's opinion, if he asked for speeches at all, he was bound to give every senator who had the right to speak, a chance of delivering himself. In that case it is hard to see any pertinence in Cicero's statement that *many* were asked to speak. It is just conceivable but not at all likely, that on the occasion of which Cicero writes, members were pressed to explain themselves at length, instead of giving a mere brief assent to some preceding speaker. Cicero would surely in such circumstances have added something to the ordinary word *rogabantur*. The supposition that the consuls had a power of closing debate is consonant with the fact that they could exclude debate altogether, and also with the old theory, never entirely put out of sight, that the senators were persons whose advice the consuls might ask or not, as they pleased.

I now return to the words in *Fam.* 1, 1, 2: 'Marcellinum tibi esse iratum scis.' Many scholars have been captivated by the brilliant correction *tibicini*, due to an old and unknown scholar. Another conjecture which has found favour is *regi* for *tibi*. Prof. Tyrrell somewhat confidently pronounces that either *tibi* or *iratum* is corrupt. With equal confidence Mendelssohn rejects the idea of corruption; while C. F. W. Mueller accepts the MSS. reading without comment. Prof. Tyrrell urges that we know of no reason why Marcellinus, especially, should have been angry with Spinther. It is not, however, necessary to look for a cause of offence special to Mar-

cellinus. The cause may have been of a general and political character. Clearly Spinther had offended many senators. I would explain by this fact the words in *Ad. Qu. Frat.* 2, 2, 3 (otherwise interpreted by Prof. Tyrrell): *sine dubio res a Lentulo remota uidetur esse, cum magno meo dolore; quamquam multa fecit quare, si fas esset, iure ei suscensere possemus.* There seems to me to be no probability in the supposition that Cicero is here referring solely to his own affairs. He often eulogizes Spinther as the warmest of his supporters, and it is hardly possible that this champion should have done *many things* which might afford his friend private reason for anger. It is true that Spinther had in 57, as consul, joined his colleague in considering, with the aid of a *consilium*, the monetary compensation which Cicero should receive for the destruction of his property while he was in exile, and that the compensation awarded seemed to Cicero inadequate. But he nowhere lays the blame on Spinther, and could even in public praise the compensation as generous. In the letter to Quintus, 2, 2, 3, Cicero speaks of the policy of obstruction in the Egyptian business as having been carried out *per obtractores Lentuli*. The phrase hits Marcellinus hard. If we read *tibi* in *Fam.* 1, 1, 2, the real difficulty seems to lie in the sudden transition from the statement that Marcellinus is angry with Spinther, to the statement that he will be the friend of Spinther in all matters which have not to do with the Alexandrine prince. If *tibi* be correct, as I think it is, some adversative particle, such as *tamen*, must have fallen out between *is* and *hac*.

J. S. REID.

DISCOVERY OF A COLLATION OF THE 'CODEX TURNEBI' OF PLAUTUS.

II.

In this article I propose to put together the chief contributions of the newly found collation to our knowledge of the text, and to submit to students of Plautus for their consideration some of the more interesting problems which it suggests. It will be well to begin with a short account of the MSS. hitherto known.

The last twelve plays of Plautus (*Bacch. Truc.*) were unknown to scholars at the

Revival of Learning, until the 'Codex Ursinianus' (*D*) was discovered. It is now in the Vatican Library, a MS. of the 11th century. In the middle of the 16th century Camerarius brought two other MSS. to light, one of the 10th century (*B*, now in the Vatican Library), and another of the 11th (*C*, now at Heidelberg). These three MSS. *BCD* are closely connected, all coming from one origin, which seems to have been

a minuscule MS., perhaps of the 9th century. There are indications that this 9th century (?) original was the immediate copy of an Archetype written in capitals, and so presumably of a date not later than the 5th century. The text of this Archetype is known as the 'Palatine' text, and our three existing MSS. are referred to the 'Palatine' family.

The discovery of the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*) of Milan, a fourth century MS. written in capitals, gave us a rival text, the 'Ambrosian' text, as it is called. Had the whole of the plays been preserved in *A*, there would be few lines of Plautus left with doubtful reading. But unfortunately all that we have is a mere fragment, and the letters are often quite illegible. Still the discovery has shewn us clearly the conditions of the problem of the Plautine text. What the textual critic has to do is to eliminate from *BCD* the errors of that common original from which they are all derived, and get back to the old 'Palatine' text of the ancient Archetype.

Of these three 'Palatine' MSS. *BCD*, two, namely *C* and *D*, are copied from a single MS. and reproduce its errors, here omitting a word or a line, there substituting a wrong word for the right one, and so on. *B*, which is a much more faithful copy of the 9th century (?) original than this MS. was, enables us to discover and correct these errors. Where *B* disagrees with *CD*, we can generally assure ourselves that the *B*-reading was the reading of the common original, while the *CD* reading is a mere corruption, due to the writer of that MS. of which *C* and *D* are immediate copies. But where *B* agrees with *CD*, the reading must be the reading of their common original. To eliminate the errors of this MS., supposed to have been a MS. of the 9th century, we need some new codex which shall act as a check on *BCD* in the same way that *B* acts as a check on *CD*.

The French scholar Adrien Turnèbe seems to have made use of a codex which fulfilled these conditions. The few, provokingly few, readings which he quotes from it in his *Adversaria* (published in 1564), shew us that it contained words and lines which had been omitted in the common original of *BCD*, while it preserved in their true form words which had been miscopied in that original. In a passage of the *Poenulus*, for example, where the Carthaginian appears on the stage, *BCD* exhibit a defective line

(v. 977):

facies quidem edepol—

But Turnebus quotes from his MS. the full line:

facies quidem edepol Punica est: guggast homo;

and when the Ambrosian Palimpsest was discovered in this century, it was found to exhibit the line in this full form. The cause of error in *BCD* is plain. The monk who wrote out their common original was puzzled, as he might well be, by the strange ending of the line, and left a blank to be supplied by the 'corrector,' the senior who supervised the copyists' work in the Scriptorium. The remissness of the 'corrector' left the blank unfilled. Further on in the same passage (v. 1033) *BCD* agree in the corrupt reading *micdilia*. Turnebus however quotes from his MS. *micdilia*, and the Ambrosian Palimpsest confirms this with its *migdilia*:

qui huc aduenisti nos captatum, migdilia.

In capital script *X* and *A* are often confused; so we may suppose that the scribe of the common original of *BCD* miscopied the *MICDILIX* of his original as *micdilia*. In default of the Palimpsest, we should have had no MS. authority to enable us to detect this error, had it not been for Turnebus' mention of the reading of his codex.

From the scanty particulars which Turnebus has communicated, it appeared that his codex, while derived from the 'Palatine' Archetype, was not derived from that 9th century (?) MS., which was the common original of *BCD*. In other words, it stood to *B* and to this original in the same relation as *B* stands to *C* and to *D*; and so would supply us with the needed check on *BCD* in the same way that *B* supplies us with a check on *CD*.

It is this 'codex Turnebi' of which a collation has been discovered on the margins of a Gryphius edition of Plautus in the Bodleian Library. The collation contains the supplement of many lines which shew a lacuna in *BCD*. Sometimes the missing words were already known to us from the quotation of Turnebus himself. Thus the marginal variant for *Poen.* 977 is *Punicast guggast homo*, which (with the correction *Punicast*) is precisely the reading of *A*. Sometimes they had been supplied by Lambinus or Scaliger, who both seem to have had access to a collation (perhaps this actual Bodleian copy) of the 'codex Turnebi.'

Sometimes they had remained unknown till the discovery of the Ambrosian Palimpsest. Here is a list of those that are now first brought to light by this collation. I give in each case the reading of *B*, then in brackets the supplements furnished by the newly found collation:

Pers. 35

— cum tibi me potis es sempiternum (*B*)

(*Emerere amicum tibi me potis es sempiternum*). This variant is preceded by the words 'et ego.'

52

Usque ero domi, dum excoxero lenoni malam
(lenoni malam rem aliquam).

205

P. Sophoclidisca, di me amabunt. *S.* Quid me? utrum hercle

(quid me. *P.* utrum hercle illis iubet).
Read *luket*.

239

P. Quid est quod metuas? *S.* Idem istuc quod tu. *P.* Di <c> ergo

(more *n.* *P.* dic ergo *S.* at uotita sum). This more *n.*, if I have deciphered it rightly, suggests *mora* 'delay.' Lambinus supplied *at vetita sum* from his 'libri veteres.'

623 — habet cor

(*Nec dolens habet cor*). Read with the Palimpsest *Ut sapiens habet cor*.

856-7 conuenisse te Toxilum me

spectatores, bene ualete, leno periit;
plaudite

(te Toxilum mi spectatores). The new reading suggests that there is no lacuna before 'spectatores' and that 'me' of *BCD* is a corruption of *mi*, or as I should prefer to spell the word, *mei*; cf. *Cist.* 678 *mi homines, mi spectatores*.

Rud. 166 Neque gubernator unquam potuit
(unquam potuit tam bene).

185 *sqq.*

Nimio hominum fortunae minus miserae memorantur

— experiundo iis datur acerbum

— hoc deo complacitum est me hoc ornatu ornatam

In incertas regiones timidam eiectam.

Hancine ego ad rem natam miseram memorabo?

Hancine ego partem capio ob pietatem praecipuam?

(*Quam in uisu experiundo...timidam eiectam Hancine ego ad rem natam miseram me memorabo hancine ego partem*). I would supply *Satin* at the beginning of v. 187 and suppose *eire* to have dropped out before *eiectam* and *ego* to have been wrongly inserted after *hancine* (v. 190).

311 *sqq.*

Famelica hominum natio: quid agitis, ut peritis?

Ut piscatorem aequum est fame sitique speque

Ecquem adolescentem huc dum hic astatis Strenua facie rubicundum fortem qui tres Duceret c <h> lamydatos cum machaer[i]is uidisti seni

(*spesque falsa Ecquem adolescentem huc dum (?) hic astatis expedite...qui tres semihomines... (uidistis) uenientem*). Lambinus from his 'veteres libri' cited 'astatis expedite' and 'qui tres semihomines.' I think that the words *uidistis eire* (?) were 'overflow' words of the third line in the Archetype, and would read: *astatis, expedite, | Vidistis eire strenua* etc. with the substitution of *secum* for *semi*. *Secum* and *eire* have already been proposed.

457

Confugiam hu[i]c: ita res suppetit subit
(*Confugiam huc. ita me suppetit subita ueniam*).

481

Heus—si, Ptolem[e]o gratia, cape hanc urnam tibi

(*Heus agasi ptolemo gratia*). This looks like a second proper name, *Agasius*. If it is, *Agasi Ptolemocratia* may be a phrase like Virgil's *Hectoris Antromache* or *Deiphobe Glauci*.

647 *sqq.* Lambinus' supplement of *plenissimus* (v. 651) is confirmed by the Oxford marginalia, but not his *paucis expedi* (v. 650). The Oxford variant for v. 650 is 'T. uis' which suggests *T. uis dicam tibi*?

664 *sqq.*

Nunc id est cum omnium copiarum atque opum

Auxili[i] praesidi[i] uiduitas nos tenet.

- cuius quae salutem afferat
- artem ingredi persequamur
- in metu nunc sumus ambae
- importunitas tantaque iniuria
- nos est modo hic intus ab nostro hero
- scelestus <s> sacerdotem anum praecipis

Reppulit, propulit perquam indignis modis.

(Senec uias...Sciamus tanto...in iniuria Orta in...praecipis. The Gryphius reading 'Qui sacram scelestus' has been altered to 'Qui scelestus'. I would read in v. 660 *Nec salus(t?) nec uiast quae salutem afferat*. For v. 667 *Nec quam in partem* has been proposed, and for v. 668 *Scimus: tanto in metu*. For v. 671 Turnebus quotes from his MS. *quin scelestus*. Leo's theory of (*est*) would preclude the possibility of *salust* for *salus est* (*Plant. Forsch. p. 255*).

686 edepol—hunc acerbum
(diem hunc).

687

T. Bonum animum habete. P. Nam, obsecro, unde—mus mihi inuenitur?
(unde istec animus mihi inuenitur). *Unde iste animus* has been already proposed.

697 sqq.

Illos scelestos qui tuum fecerunt fanum parui

- arenosque ut han<c> tua pace aram obsidere
- aut hae ambae sumus opera Neptunei noctu
- habeas, neue idcirco nobis uicio uortas.

(Scire nosque ut hanc tua pace aram obsidere...aut ae ambae sumus opera Neptuni noctu Indignum id habeas neue idcirco nobis uicio uertas). Before the words 'Scire...obsidere' stands what I suppose to be the variant of the inferior MS.: 'Are nosque ut hanc tua pace aram obsidere.' After them comes 'app(aret)versum ita legendum ac aedendum. Uleiscare nosque ut hanc tua pace aram obsidere.' At the end comes a note to the effect that a 'lacuna grandiuscula' was to be seen before the words 'ae ambae' and that 'deest' was written in the margin. Then 'fort. pro "aut ambae" "eiectae ambae" sumus'). I suspect the *scire* to be a scribe's conjectural emendation of the imperfect word which began the line in the Archetype, SCARE. We have already had a similar case in *Pers.* 623 where, I

fancy, the Archetype, had merely IENSKA-BETCOR.

712 sq.

Meas mihi ancillas inuito me eripis—
De senatu Cyrenensi quemuis opulentum—

(Meas mihi ancillas inuito me eripis. L. habe inniceus (?) de senatu Cyrenensi quis (*leg.* quemuis) opulentum uirum). This is followed by the note 'app(arenter) "habe indicem.(?)"' The ending of v. 713 can be read in the Palimpsest, but the letters at the end of the preceding line are illegible. Read *habe iudicem* (cf. v. 1380).

To enumerate all the new readings supplied by the Oxford marginalia would take too much space. I must confine myself to selecting some that have either never been proposed or at least have not found favour in the last editions. The *B*-reading is placed first and the new reading follows in brackets:—

Poen. 266.

Prosedas, pistorum amicas, reliquias al[i]i-
carias.
(reginas allicarias.)

504

Ita me di ament tardo amico nihil[i] est
quicquam inequius.

(nequius). *Nequius* makes alliteration.
Cf. *Bacch.* 651 nequius nil est quam egens
consili seruos.

Rud. 727.

D. Hae autem Veneri complacuerunt habeat
si argentum dabit.

(Si autem uenit etc.). This note follows:
'eadem persona lenon(is) loquente.' The
Palimpsest seems to begin the line with *Si*.

Pseud. 1272 sqq.

Corde atque animo suo opsequentes, sed
post

Quam exurrexi, orant me[i]d ut saltem.

Ad hunc me modum intulit illis satis facete
nime ex disciplina.

(illis satisfacere me). This note follows:
'fort(asse) intulit ut illis.'

Poen. 586.

Hodie iuris coctiores non sunt, qui lites
creant.

(hodie iuris cretiores). I am not quite
sure of the second and third letters of the

last word (3 cro-, cre-). Turnebus *Adv.* xv. 7 supports the reading *coctiores* (*BCD*).

1075

Ostende: inspic[i]am: aperi, audi: atque aues.

(Ostende inspiciam aperi audi atque aues). The last word is not written immediately after *atque* but in the next line under *audi*, so may conceivably have been meant for a correction of *audi*. In any case it suggests what I think is the true reading: *aperi—auaes?—atque adest* 'open it—will you? There it is!' with *auaes* in the sense of *si auaes* or *sodes*.

Scarcely less important are the cases where the new collation confirms the reading of some one MS. or group of MSS. It shows, for example, that the reading of *BCD* in that puzzling line, *Poen.* 1168, was also the reading of the 'Palatine' archetype:

Thraecae sunt caelum ne sustolli soleni

(Thraecae sunt celumnae sustolli solem). The last word may be 'solent' or possibly 'soleni.' The true reading is no doubt *solent*; but what are we to make of the rest of the line? The 'Palatine' reading is confirmed by the Palimpsest which seems to read something like TKRACAESVNTincelONEM (by the small type I indicate the most doubtful letters). Surely there is a reference to the mares of Diomedes. The Palimpsest reading clearly suggests the word κῆλον.

In *Poen.* 1036 the word *tu* in the Gryphus text is expunged, but there is no indication whether this variant comes from the 'codex Turnebi' or from the inferior MS. The Palimpsest also omits *tu*, requiring the scansion *hūic* (cf. Leo ad *Amph.* 702):

Maledicere huic temperabis, si sapis.

The Palimpsest reading is again confirmed in *Poen.* 1237: *Ite si itis*, to be scanned *It(e) si itis*.

In *Rud.* 745 *B* offers:

Argentum ego pro istisce ambabus cuias erant domino dedi.

CD omit *ego*. Neither the metre nor the sense is affected by the presence or absence of the word; but the new collation helps us out of the difficulty by confirming the reading of *B*.

Anything that brings us nearer to the actual text of the ancient 'Palatine' Archetype is likely to increase our knowledge of the way in which a Roman play was divided into scenes and the cantica or choruses into lines in ancient editions. In the immediate

original of *BCD* the short lines of a Canticum were written together in one long line for the sake of economizing space, and in various ways the genuine division of the lines was abandoned. The new collation gives us here and there useful hints for the re-arrangement of Cantica, by indicating that this or that word should begin the line. It also retains several scene-headings in their original form, with the indication of whether the scene was a dialogue (diverbiū) or a musical scene (canticum). For example, the scene-heading of *Pseud.* IV. ii. BALLIO IDEM, had in the 'codex Turnebi' the sign C, i.e. 'canticum,' a sign which was not understood by the writer (Turnebus?) of the marginal note accompanying this variant: 'fort(asse) "idem collocutores" vult.' Prof. Klotz's theory that scenes in Iambic Septenarii, and even, on occasion, scenes in Iambic Senarii, might be musical scenes is confirmed by the scene-headings preserved in the new collation. For instance, both *Pers.* II. v. (Iamb. Sept.) and *Pers.* IV. vi. (Iamb. Sen.) have the sign C. We learn, too, for the first time, that the 'codex Turnebi,' and presumably the 'Palatine' Archetype, had in the last line of the *Poenulus* and the *Persa* the Greek omega-sign, ω, before the word *plaudite*. In the *Persa* it seems to have been accompanied by the word *pantes* (whence the *pantio* of *BCD*), to judge from Turnebus' (?) note in the margin of the Bodleian Gryphus:—

'pantes D(ua)r. plaudite. pariter ω vero chor(um)loquenti (sic) s(ignifi)cat ut fine praecedentis comediae euremus ω plaudite.'

For the Carthaginian passage in the *Poenulus* we have a large number of variants, which, it is to be hoped, come from the 'codex Turnebi' and not from the inferior MS. It remains to be seen whether they will bring Semitic scholars any nearer to the interpretation of that interesting relic of a lost language.

When a new MS. is discovered, there is always a temptation to make too much of its readings. I will conclude this article with an example of a variant, which I think belongs to the 'codex Turnebi,' and is palpably wrong.' In *Poen.* 926 the 'Palatine' Archetype had *hoc nocte consulendum*. The Oxford marginalia offer *hoc noctu*. But the Palimpsest shows us the true reading, *hoc docte*.

[NOTE.—A full list of the more interesting variants preserved in the Oxford marginalia will be found in the (*Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, Nos. 22 sqq.)]

W. M. LINDSAY,

THE GRANT OF IMMUNITAS TO BRUNDISIUM.

ACCORDING to Appian, Sulla on landing in Italy in B.C. 83 was received by the inhabitants of Brundisium without any show of resistance. In return for this he granted them later ἀτέλεια, and they enjoyed that privilege still in Appian's own day. The historian's words are

‘δεξαμένων δ’ αὐτὸν ἀμαχῇ τῶν Βρεντεσίων τοῖσδε μὲν ὑστερον ἔδωκεν ἀτέλειαν ἣν καὶ νῦν ἔχουσιν.’
(B.C. I. 79.)

A Latin colony had been founded at Brundisium in 244 B.C. But by the end of the Social War, *i.e.* before the time of which Appian in the above passage is writing, the city like all the rest of Italy had been granted the Roman civitas. It was allotted to the Tribus Maecia and ranked as a municipium, which rank it retained during the Empire. These are facts generally recognized. (Mommsen, *C.I.L.* ix. p. 8. Capelli, *Diz. Epig.* p. 1047, etc.)

This passage of Appian therefore offers a somewhat interesting problem. What was this Immunitas thus conferred about the year 80 B.C. on an Italian city community possessed of the Roman civitas, which also seems still to have differentiated that community from others in Italy in the days of Marcus Aurelius? For it is obvious that Appian's ἀτέλεια here is the equivalent of the technical term Immunitas. Unfortunately he does not specify it further. Hence we are left face to face with the above problem. For as it has been recently said ‘welche Bedeutung ἀτέλεια ohne nähere Bezeichnung hat lässt sich nicht immer festsetzen.’ (Pauly, *R. Enc.* p. 1911.)

We have at least these criteria in our attempt after a more exact characterisation of this Immunitas:

(1) It was a privilege bestowed on full Roman cives—on a whole city community of cives in Italy itself.

(2) It was a privilege still retained by that city community in Appian's own day, which thus still distinguished Brundisium from other cities in Italy.

(3) The original grant of this privilege was owed to Sulla about the year 80 B.C. This at least was either the popular tale in Appian's time or he found it so stated in his authorities. In the latter case, he may very well have derived the fact from the Memoirs of Sulla himself.

What then were the burdens from which the citizens of Brundisium were thus relieved? Some attempted answers to the question do not seem very satisfactory.

[a] Was this ἀτέλεια Immunitas from direct taxes which otherwise would have been levied on the Brundisians as cives in 80 B.C.?

This seems improbable. For the only direct taxes a Roman cives would have had to pay then were

i. (possibly) The Tributum.

ii. The Vicesima manumissionum.

i. *The Tributum.*

It is certain that in practice this extraordinary tax was never levied after 167 B.C. until the days of the triumvirate in 43 B.C. (Pliny, *N.H.* 33, 56. Cic. *de Off.* ii. 22, 76. *Val. Max.* iv. 3, 8. Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 38). It seems however that it was never legally abolished—and thus the possibility of its being levied always existed. (Cic. *pro Flacco*, 32, 80. *Phil.* ii. 37, 93. *De Off.* ii. 21, 74. Dio Cass. 52, 6). Thus it might be urged the Immunitas granted Brundisium by Sulla was Immunitas from liability to pay tributum if it should ever again be levied.

Yet this very statement of the suggestion shows its own great improbability. In 80 B.C. the tributum had not been levied for nearly a century and there seemed no prospect of its being revived. Surely a grant of Immunitas from such a non-existent tax would have been—viewed as a privilege—somewhat of a mockery. Moreover this could have hardly been a privilege distinguishing the city in Appian's own day. For it seems almost certain that though the tributum was revived as an extraordinary tax by the triumvirate in 43 B.C., yet it was afterwards dropped again, and was not levied in the first and second centuries A.D. The tributum mentioned in Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 51, almost certainly applied to negotiatores not in Italy but in the provinces. (Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsver.* ii. pp. 171–173, espec. p. 172, N. 3).

Therefore that Sulla granted Brundisium Immunitas from the tributum seems to me an unsatisfactory explanation.

ii. *The Vicesima Manumissionum* or *Liber-tatis*.

This tax, levied first in 357 B.C. (Livy vii. 16, 7) seems therefore to have been the one and only direct tax a Roman cives was bound to pay in 80 B.C. (Cf. Cic. *ad Att.* ii,

16. Marquardt, *op. cit.* ii. p. 156, 271, 272.) It existed still in Cicero's time and was exacted under the Emperors throughout the whole Empire, till raised by Caracalla to 10 per cent. But if the master would not pay it on the freeing of a slave, the slave had to pay it himself. Immunitas therefore from this tax could hardly have been a great boon to the Brundisians in 80 B.C. In fact the tax is altogether somewhat too insignificant to allow us with easy consciences to accept it as an explanation of the ἀτέλεια in question existing in 80 B.C. and in the second century A.D.

Thus it is unlikely this Immunitas applied to direct taxes levied, or possibly to be levied, on cives in 80 B.C.

[b] But the previous question may be raised. It seems to be cautiously suggested that though Brundisium received the civitas before Sulla's landing, yet the financial consequences may not have followed immediately. Thus the city still continued to pay its old taxes which it had paid previously as a Latin colony. And what Sulla granted therefore was Immunitas from these. This seems to be the view held by Capelli, who says, speaking of Brundisium 'ebbe la cittadinanza romana al tempo della guerra sociale e fu allora inscritta nella tribù Maecia. La immunità in genere e forse da speciali imposte non fu concessa alla città che da Sulla.' (*Diz. Epig.* p. 1047).

Now of course it is an interesting question enough as to how rapidly the financial adjustment consequent on the universal grant of civitas in Italy was effected. But none the less it seems to me hardly necessary to stay on this account to discuss what were the taxes Brundisium paid as a Latin colony. For the privilege bestowed on the city by Sulla seems, as we have seen, still to have differentiated it from other Italian cities in Appian's day. Now it is plainly impossible to believe that those cities which before the Social War had been Latin colonies continued to pay their old munera as long after their enfranchisement as the second century A.D. This theory therefore fails to explain the problem satisfactorily.

[c] And precisely the same objection may be urged against Merivale's view of Sulla's act. For Merivale goes yet one step beyond Capelli, when he says, speaking of this general grant of civitas after the Social War:—

'Several cities...continued steadfastly to reject it...Brundisium did not at once accept it, but received the Roman privilege of Im-

munity from the land tax at a later period from Sulla.'

(*Fall of Rom. Rep.* c. 3, p. 97.)

Even though the Brundisians had been so foolish as to wait before receiving a part instead of at once accepting the whole of a boon, yet clearly long before Marcus Aurelius the free inhabitants of the city were full cives, and thus this explanation like the preceding fails to satisfy the second of our criteria. This very passage seems the sole basis of Merivale's theory.

[d] Another suggested solution is attractive at first sight. Marquardt (*op. cit.* i. 361–363) points out that under the Republic a municipium had ranked in importance above a colonia. But under the Empire this was reversed, and the colonia took precedence over the municipium. The colonia then might possess three privileges.

i. Libertas, from supervision of governor.
ii. Jus Italicum, i.e. Quiritarian rights in land ownership.
iii. Immunitas.

Therefore municipia came to desire to attain the jus coloniae. So Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 27:—'At in Italia vetus oppidum Puteoli jus coloniae et cognomentum a Nerone apiscuntur.' Gellius 16, 13.—'Hadrianus mirari se ostendit quod et ipsi Italicenses et quaedam item alia municipia antiqua, in quibus Uticenses nominat, cum suis moribus legibusque uti possent, in jus coloniae mutari gestiverint.' Now Brundisium was a municipium under the Empire. It is therefore suggested that Sulla granted it the Immunitas which was a feature of the jus coloniae, and this possession still distinguished it from other less fortunate Italian municipia in Appian's day.

But tempting though this interpretation may appear, it too proves unsatisfactory as soon as the question is raised 'Immunitas from what?' It is quite true that Immunitas was granted during the early Empire to communities of Roman cives. But these must all for very intelligible reasons have been outside of Italy. For communities of cives outside of Italy were liable to burdens which no Italian city had to bear. We have this stated in the clearest possible terms:—

'Prima enim conditio possidendi haec est ac per Italiam ubi nullus ager est tributarius. At si ad provincias respiciamus, habent agros colonicos eisdem juris, habent et colonicos qui sunt immunes, habent et colonicos stipendiarios.'

(Frontin, p. 35, Lachm. cf. Paulus, *Dig.* 50, 15, 8, §§ 5, and 7.)

Therefore on many a colony of Roman *cives outside Italy* it was possible to bestow that part of the *jus Italicum* known as *Immunitas*. For many such a colony paid the *tributum soli*. But a grant of this 'Immunitas' to a community inside Italy would have been meaningless. For none such paid any *tributum soli*. Brundisium like the rest enjoyed all possible *Immunitas* already, so far as direct burdens existing already in Sulla's day went. Puteoli in A.D. 60, and the 'ipsi Italicenses' in Hadrian's day, cannot have desired the *jus coloniae* to win *Immunitas* thereby, but for other reasons. For *Immunitas* they possessed already. We may not therefore argue from the position of a *colonia civ. Rom.* overseas to Brundisium, nor suppose the *Immunitas* won by such a colony at times to be anything but meaningless when applied to any *municipium* in Italy. This interpretation also proves inadequate.

[e] *Immunitas* under the Empire of course frequently meant freedom from the burdens of municipal office and municipal taxes. Clearly however this cannot be the *ἀτέλεια* thus bestowed on an entire community by Sulla. For in this case obviously there might have existed at any time neither municipality at all nor municipal chest. At any time municipal administration might have become impossible.

[f] Nor finally does it seem likely this was *Immunitas* from military service. Not only would this have scarcely been a boon, when the liability to such service became more and more theoretical than practical. But there are three Brundisian Inscriptions relative to service in fleet and army. (*C.I.L.* ix. 41, 42, 43).

None therefore of the above six explanations of this *ἀτέλεια* seems to me convincingly satisfactory. One possible explanation is left, and so far as I can discover one other only. And this is perhaps more promising than its predecessors.

Brundisium being a harbour city, it seems attractive to suppose that Sulla desiring to stimulate its trade made it a free port, or at least abolished the *portoria* there levied. An *ἀτέλεια* from such customs dues would always be an important gain to a harbour city. (Cf. Pauly, *R.E.* p. 1913, v. 5-10). But how far does this rendering of *Immunitas* satisfy the criteria?

The history of *portoria* in Italy is not devoid of interest, *i.e.* of difficulties. Under the Republic they were commonly levied at Italian ports, as at Puteoli in 199 B.C. (Livy, 32, 7) and Caius Gracchus extended the

system widely (Vell. Pat. ii. 6). Therefore in Sulla's time Brundisium would almost certainly be liable to these dues, and a grant of *ἀτέλεια* from them be as real a benefit to the commercial prosperity of the city as Roman merchants at Delos found it in 167 B.C. Thus the first criterion is satisfied.

But *portoria* were generally abolished throughout Italy by the *Lex Caecilia* of 60 B.C. (Cic. *ad Att.* ii. 16. *ad Q. fr.* i. 1, 11, 33. Dio Cass. 37, 51.) Hence if it be true that this *Immunitas* still served to distinguish Brundisium in the days of Marcus Aurelius, this interpretation too seems unhappily imperilled. But not, I think, without hope of escape.

Julius Caesar, we are told, 'peregrinarum mercium portoria instituit.' (Sueton, *Caes.* 43.) What precisely this means is not quite clear. But even if it be taken at its least extension *i.e.* to mean that Julius laid a customs tax on all foreign goods imported into the Empire from lands outside the Empire (as Schiller, *Die röm. Staatsalt.*, Müller, *Handbücher*, iv. 2, p. 678,) yet *Immunitas* from these might have meant something to a port like Brundisium. But in the second century A.D. the *portoria* may have meant considerably more than this. Not that I think we may press Dio's tale of the new *τέλη* introduced by the Triumvirate in 43 A.C. to include a revival of *portoria* (as Mr. Richards suggests in *Dict. Antiq.*) with any great confidence. But Tacitus, speaking of the year 58 A.D., says:—

'Eodem anno crebis populi flagitationibus immodestiam publicanorum arguentis, dubitavit Nero an cuncta vectigalia omitti juberet ... sed impetum eius... attinuerunt Senatores dissolutionem imperii docendo si fructus quibus res publica sustineretur deminuerentur, quippe sublati portorii sequens ut tributum abolitio expostularetur.'

(*Ann.* xiii. 50.)

The 'people' which made complaint can hardly be held to exclude the citizens of Rome and Italy. And Cicero tells us that it was just the exactions of the publicani with regard to the collection of these very *portoria* which earlier were so bitterly resented. (*Ad Q. frat.* i. 1, 11, 33. So cf. Plutarch, *De Curios.* vol. viii p. 60 R.) These *portoria* thus existing again under Nero were not abolished till for a short time by Pertinax who

'τέλη τε πάντα τὰ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῆς τυραννίδος εἰς εἰσφοράν χρημάτων ἐπινοηθέντα ἐπὶ τε ὄχθαις

ποταμῶν καὶ λιμέσι πόλεων...καταλύσας ἐς
τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ ἐλευθερον ἀφῆκεν.¹
(Herodian, ii. 4, 7.)

Soon after which they were again re-instituted. (*Cod. Just.* 4, 61, 6. Marquardt, *op. cit.* ii. p. 262, N. 5.)

Thus portoria of some kind undoubtedly existed in Italian ports in Appian's day. Immunitas from these would have been a great benefit to Brundisium and have served to distinguish the city from others as occupying a peculiarly favourable position in the second century A.D. as well as under Sulla. This therefore seems to me the most probable rendering of Appian's vague statement with regard to the ἀτέλεια.

This question however remains. It is clear that for some time after 60 B.C. Brundisium was but on a level with all other Italian ports as regards freedom from portoria, but was again superior to most under Marcus Aurelius.

On the reintroduction of portoria therefore, to whom are we to ascribe the continuance or re-granting of this old Sullan privilege to the city? Here, so far as I know, conjecture only is possible. We may suppose either

(1) That when the portoria were revived, Brundisium made good its claim to special exemption because of its original bestowal by Sulla: or

(2) That a concession similar to that of Sulla was made to the city by some Emperor before Appian's day.

For if Appian had found the city enjoying this immunity in his own time, and knew that it had enjoyed a similar privilege under Sulla, he was in every way capable of implying that Brundisium had retained this ἀτέλεια uninterruptedly from 80 B.C. to his own lifetime. Though indeed his words need not be pressed to imply this.

Of the alternatives I must think the latter rather the more probable. For when all Italian ports had enjoyed this Immunitas for a good many years, it does not seem to me very likely that on the revival of the system of portoria a claim to exemption on the ground of a still earlier gift would be very readily accepted. Of course we tend here to be involved in a veritable quagmire of the *a priori*. But if we may attribute Brundisium's Immunitas with somewhat greater probability to a subsequent grant by an Emperor between Nero and Marcus Aurelius, I think there can be small hesitation before we choose Trajan as the Princeps most likely to confer the boon anew. Not

indeed because Trajan remitted a portorium also on the Roman market (Marquardt, *op. cit.* ii. p. 270, N. 4). But because this would have been a measure so thoroughly in accord with this Emperor's endeavour to stimulate Italian trade on the East as well as on the West coast of Italy. And that Brundisium was the chosen centre for this endeavour, the construction of the great Via Traiana thither from Beneventum may serve to show. (Cf. *C.I.L.* ix. 37.)

Lastly there is a passage in the first chapter of the *De Rhetoribus* of Suetonius which is of considerable interest in this connection.¹ Suetonius is there describing the growth of the study of rhetoric. He says that the method of instruction which finally prevailed was that of using 'veteres controversiae'; that these were derived either 'ex historiis, sicut sane nonnullae usque adhuc,' or 'ex veritate ac re, si forte recens accidisset; itaque locorum etiam appellationibus additis proponi solebant. Sic certe collectae editaeque se habent, ex quibus non alienum fuerit unam et alteram exempli causa ad verbum referre.'

Therefore he immediately inserts two such examples. The first, which deals with a fishing bargain at Ostia, does not concern us. The second is for us the important one. It reads

'Venalei cum Brundusi gregem venalium e navi educerent, formoso et pretioso puero, quod portitores verebantur, bullam et praetextam togam imposuerunt; facile fallaciam celarunt. Romam venit, res cognita est, petitur puer, quod domini voluntate fuerit liber, in libertatem.'

This it seems is a genuine passage of Suetonius and written probably between the years 106-113 A.D. (Cf. Roth, *Sueton.* Praef. pp. lxxv.-lxxviii.).

This passage proves the existence of portoria at Brundisium. The question is as to the time to which it refers. It is clearly an example cited as illustrating the second class of 'controversiae,' i.e. those 'ex veritate ac re, si forte recens accidisset.' On this question of date then we may note

(1) That it may be held to be one of the 'recent examples' by Suetonius, who is writing under Trajan.

(2) That yet it had happened long enough ago to be included then in a published collection of such controversiae.

(3) That the last example of such school-

¹ My best thanks are due to Mr. Warde Fowler of Lincoln College for suggesting it to me.

boy declamations quoted in this part of the treatise is that of 'Nero Caesar primo imperii anno.'

That a sure inference can be drawn from these three points I do not of course for one moment propose to maintain. But in view of these it *does* seem to me the most likely hypothesis to ascribe this incident of the exaction of portoria at Brundisium to a time before the reign of Trajan and probably after Nero's accession. Thus viewed, the passage is a confirmation of Tacitus *Ann.* xiii. 50 as to the revival of portoria again after their abolition in B.C. 60. And also it tends to strengthen the theory I venture in this paper to propose, viz.: that Trajan revived the gift once bestowed on Brundisium by Sulla.

Therefore from this chance allusion in Appian I would suggest the inference that Brundisium's trade and commercial prosperity were objects of interest to Sulla the Dictator, and also to some one of the Emperors before Marcus Aurelius; and further that Trajan is the Princeps to whom this may be best ascribed. But as one great justification for these conclusions must be the necessary rejection of all other explanations of this ἀτέλεια as less probable, I have therefore attempted to prove this in the first part of this paper.

BERNARD W. HENDERSON.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD.
March, 1897.

SOME HOMERIC GENITIVES.

THE ordinary assumption is, I suppose, that Homer uses the genitives in -ov, i.e. -oo, or -oio, indifferently as suits his verse; for myself at any rate, I always had made that assumption. It is obvious of course that with certain words the genitive in -oio is impossible for an epic poet. All words with short penultimate and long antepenultimate must make the genitive in -oo, Ἀξιοῖο for instance being impossible. Again a long penultimate and short antepenultimate can only allow of the longer genitive at the expense of its being elided; thus for example Μεvelάδοιο is practically removed and the poets had to fall back on Μεvelάδοο.¹ The case is similar with words like ζόφος; ζόφοιο being impossible the poet could only use ζόφοο.

But it is equally certain, though less obvious, that in the days when the genitive was only in -oio or -oo, when the latter was not yet contracted into -ov, no word could make its genitive in -oo if its penultimate and antepenultimate were both short; thus ἀπαλόο would be out of the question and the poet can only have used ἀπαλοῖο. At this

period, which is pre-Homeric, there were three classes of the words with which I am now concerned; first, those which made the genitive only in -oio, secondly those which made it only in -oo, thirdly those which made it in both, as μύθοιο and μύθοιο, δόμοο and δόμοιο, (δόμοο being possible by elision of final o which must surely have once been permissible, whether or not in Homer, or else by interlengthening of final o or lengthening before two consonants).

Now it appeared to me a somewhat interesting question whether any traces of this state of things exist still in Homer. I argued that if my speculations about the pre-Homeric condition, when -oo was not yet contracted, were correct, we might find that words like μέγαρον, Ἀλκίνοος, ἐύξεστος etc. make the genitive in -oio much more frequently than in -ov.

Accordingly I read through the *Odyssey* (down to ψ. 296 *bien entendu*) noting all the genitives of either of these two forms. With the aid of Dunbar's *Concordance*² I then made a list of all of them, which I tabulated and now present the results.

Let us first take the words which are metrically equivalent to θάνατος or ἀπαλός.

¹ Whether Μεvelάδοι and the like were ever much used is a difficult question. That we hardly or never find such words with hiatus of -ov in *these* in our text might be explained on the hypothesis that such hiatus has been removed by alteration of the text, insertion of a particle or something of the kind. But my own view is that such a form as Μεvelάδοο by the Homeric period had been almost or altogether driven out by the great natural advantages of such forms as Μεvelάδοο.

² In such a prodigious task as making a *Concordance* we must expect a few errors, and it is from no spirit of hostile criticism that I observe that some such are to be found here. Thus ἀμφιπόλου and χρυσοπέδλου are both omitted by Dr. Dunbar. But if I have lost two or three cases, it will make no difference to the general results in so great a number.

From these there are in the *Odyssey* 217 genitives in *-οιο* and 55 in *-ου* (16 before a vowel, 39 before a consonant). Next words metrically equivalent to Ἀλκίνοος: 212 in *-οιο* 61 in *-ου* (25 before a vowel, 36 before a consonant, and of these 36 proper names furnish 23, and 6 of the 36 are in late passages). I take ἡμέτερον as the reading of β. 55, η. 301, ρ. 534 for ἡμετέρου is almost certainly wrong there, though given by the *Concordance* from the text of Ameis. Thirdly, other words where *-οο* is impossible, as ἀποιχόμενος, δολιχέρεμος, κασίγνητος etc.: 36 in *-οιο*, 16 in *-ου* (8 before a vowel, 8 before a consonant). Thus taking all three sets together, we have 465 genitives in *-οιο* against only 132 in *-ου*.

So far then the conjecture is verified. It really is true that the traces of an ancient time, when the genitive in *-οο* was not yet contracted, are to be found in Homer—and not in the most ancient part of him. But still there is a chance that it may be only because the long genitive is more convenient for the hexameter than the short, though as I have taken three classes of words separately and got the same results in all, this can hardly account for it. We must test the results then somehow, but this requires very great care. I have formerly had occasion to observe how much commoner the short genitive is than the long in the Bucolic poets; if we were to take a test from them, this peculiarity would make it worthless. But again if we should take our test from Apollonius, still more if from Nonnus, it would be vitiated by the opposite defect; for these conscious imitators of Homer, probably to give an archaic air to their compositions, use the long genitive by preference more than Homer does himself. We seem therefore to be reduced to Hesiod and the Hymns; I will take the *Works and Days*. Here (taking all three classes together) we have 26 genitives in *-οιο*¹ against 27 in *-ου*. The conclusion is that we might naturally expect the two forms to be about equally used, and that the great inequality in Homer is due to some disturbing cause, which cannot well, so far as I can see, be any other than that which I have suggested.

If such marked traces are to be found of a state of things when the genitive in *-οο* was not yet contracted into *-ου*, we have two ways of explaining the phenomenon open to us. Either in the Homeric period such contraction was still comparatively rare and

was to a considerable degree avoided, or else the long forms had become so far fixed with μέγαρον and Ἀλκίνοος and the rest that they still were naturally used with these words, even though there was no objection any longer felt to scanning *-οο* as a monosyllable. Partly, no doubt, the preponderance of the long forms is due to old phrases being kept from the pre-Homeric period, but this can have had very little influence, and certainly is not the main cause. We might try to decide the question by seeing whether the long forms are commoner in the common words, of which μέγαρον might be quoted as a very strong example, for there are 44 instances of μεγάροιο against only one of μεγάρου; whether any conclusion can be drawn from the more numerous contractions of proper names I much doubt; but in any case I prefer to attack the problem from a different point of view. If the former hypothesis is the correct one, that is to say if there was still a certain difficulty in the Homeric period in contracting the genitive in *-οο*, then we ought to find that words like νόστον, Θηβαίων, and others where both the longer and the shorter forms were equally possible, are generally in such a position in the line that they can be resolved. Taking then the words which are trochaic in the *Odyssey*, as ἀγρός,² I find 77 unresolvable genitives in *-ου* against 121 or 126 resolvable; but of these 77 there are 44 at the end of a line, that is to say there are over 160 such genitives with the *-ου* in *thesi* to only 33 with it in *arsis*. And this is easily intelligible; with νήσοο for instance gradually becoming νήσον, it is obvious that it would be a much less shock to the ear to keep νήσοο with the metrical beat on the first syllable; it is when the beat is thrown on to the second syllable that the ear will feel the objection to it. If I may venture to quote my own feelings, I think this distinction is valid. I have long felt something odd about such lines as τὸν δ' οἶον νόστον κεχημένον, and a sort of instinct to be saying to myself νόστοο κεχημένον though I knew it to be wrong. But I never felt anything of the kind about a genitive at the end of a line.

In the *Works and Days* we have 6 resolvable genitives of this kind, 8 with *-ου* in *arsis*, 8 at the end of lines. The numbers are small but show plainly which way the wind blows.

Ought we then always to write *-οο* in Homer when we can? Nobody writes

² I have to omit τούτου, αὐτοῦ, τολού, as they are not in the *Concordance*.

¹ I am assuming the true reading of 705 to be εἴθε ἄτερ δαελοῖο καὶ ὠμῶ γήρα' ἔδωκεν.

στηθη for στήθεα in Ionic poetry, even when στήθεα is a spondee: why then should we not write νήσοο for νήσου even when it is a spondee and leave the reader to see the scansion for himself? The only objection would be that in many of the instances we have -ου before a vowel. Are we then to write Φοίκο' ἀπερχομένη? And why not after all, when ἔγχε' ἐρειδόμενος and the rest have been accepted? However it is obviously better to remain content with the ordinary reading in such cases; moreover it is very doubtful whether it does not come to the same thing; see Mr. Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, § 381. All that I feel at all sure about is that there was a certain reluctance to have the -ου in *arsi*, and this of course bears upon the first class of words such as ἀπαλός, Τηλέμαχος, κασιγνήτος; for these, if they have the short genitive at all, must have it in *arsi*.

I proceed to the last class I shall consider, the genitives of pyrrhics, as δόμος. Omit-

ting those of ἐμός, ἐφός, ζύγον, θρόνος, κτύπος, σπώδος, στράτος, σκοπός, as either not in the *Concordance* or vitiated by beginning with two consonants so that ζύγοιο, etc. are impossible, I find in the *Odyssey*, 74 genitives in -οιο, 40 in -ου short before a vowel, 7 in -ου long before a vowel, 22 in -ου before a consonant. Thus we have 29 in *arsi* to 40 in *thesi*. Compare now the *Works and Days*: 4 in -οιο, 4 in -ου short before a vowel, 3 in -ου long before a vowel, 8 in -ου before a consonant; i.e. 11 in *arsi* to 4 in *thesi*. Again we see the same objection in Homeric verse to -ου in *arsi*. In the whole *Odyssey* from the first line to the bitter end I make the total number of instances of -ου in *arsi* (except τοῦ) to be 239. This includes one or two words like Αἰόλου which should be read Αἰόλοο. The proportion is thus about one in fifty lines. In the spurious termination it is perceptibly higher, about one in thirty.

ARTHUR PLATT.

PROFESSOR FRANCKEN'S EDITION OF LUCAN.

PROFESSOR FRANCKEN has paid me the high compliment of replying to my criticisms of his edition of Lucan I—V [*C.R.* Feb. 1897]. It was perhaps hardly necessary to admit that my remarks were so often justified, even for the sake of explaining how the mistake arose. It is on the other hand a good thing to have an exact statement that codices U and V are in the new edition represented by a fresh and minute collation made by Prof. Francken himself. I never dreamt of implying that this was not so: but I am very glad to be told plainly that it is so.

The Professor's tone is not conciliatory. Let me say, if it be needed, that I was not hunting for chances of finding fault. Where he now shews that evidence of MS readings is wrongly given in Hosius and rightly in his own book, I am the first to welcome the vindication. In one or two places I had, it seems, not caught the exact meaning of his critical note: for which I am truly sorry.

I will not pass in wearisome review all the passages in which Prof. Francken's replies seem to me unsatisfactory. But here is a pretty instance of our differences. On I 453 I objected to the critical note '*datur UMP*', on the ground that the

editor had no codex P available here. I suggested that this was a slip. His reply is that P stands for 'Proverbia', and he refers me to the 'indculus praemissus'. I hope I do not err in taking this to mean the list on page xlii headed '*notae codicum*'. Anyhow I find there a mention of '*de libro Lucani proverbialia* (Rhein. Mus. 1891)'. And the abbreviate symbol given for it is not 'P' but 'Prov'. Who is to blame?

When he comes to the interpretation of certain passages the Professor not seldom represents me as having said what I certainly did not say. I have only to apologize for having in these cases failed in conveying my meaning. He seems also, in discussing his alterations of the received text, to argue as though both sides stood on an equal footing. Now I rather hold that a corrector has a double task—first to displace the received text, then to make good his own. I still think that Dr. Francken seldom does the former, much less the latter, with success.

I will add a few words in reference to his argument against my reverence for the MSS tradition in the case of Lucan. The MSS do not, he says, carry us back further than the Carolingian age. He seems to fancy that I believe the text to have come

down to us without having suffered corruption during the eight centuries after Lucan's death. I certainly neither said nor thought anything of the sort. My contention is this. On Prof. Francken's own shewing [pp. xxii, xxvii] the recension now represented by V and its kindred MSS is as old as the fifth century at least. M and its kindred are derived from a separate line of copies. This is set forth by Dr. Francken [p. xxxvi]. Therefore in one form or other we have two independent lines of tradition. If this be so, what is the authority of readings in which both traditions agree? I said (and say still), it is so great that we ought not to set it aside on the ground of arguments from within, unless those arguments are of quite overwhelming cogency. Further, assume that the collective wisdom of modern scholars decides that a certain traditional reading is undoubtedly corrupt. Nay, assume again that they agree to accept a particular correction. And lastly, assume that this 'correction' is an improvement. I answer as follows. I respect the negative *virorum doctorum consensus*, but it does not amount to mathematical certainty. Affirmative *consensus* is very rare indeed, and it tells only (at the most) what the writer ought to have written. In the case of Lucan there is no little reason for thinking that he often wrote what he had better not have written. Therefore, to improve the text is not necessarily the same thing as restoring the author's words. The inference

is, put what you please in your notes, but be very slow to meddle with the text.

To take a recent instance. In VII 141 we have *tunc omnis lancea saxo erigitur*. The late Prof. Nettleship proposed *derigitur*. This Dr. Postgate rightly rejects, but conjectures *corrigitur*. Mr Owen (*C.R.* April 1897) rejects this, and proposes *exigitur*. Now there is negative agreement enough. But what is the metaphor in *erigitur*? I believe it means 'set up straight on end', applied to what has been beaten down. A daring way of saying 'brought to a point', but I do not think it is too bold for Lucan. The spear head is to begin with rather blunt than bent, and it is ground to a new point. The sense of 'made fit for action' may also hang about the word. Compare Stat. Theb. iii 582-4

tunc fessa putri robigine pila
haerentesque situ gladios in saeva recurrent
uolnera et attrito cogunt iuuenescere saxo.

and Sidon Apollinaris vii 412

dum falce recocta
ictibus informat saxoque cacuminat ensem.

With the MSS tradition at its back, I would let *erigitur* stand.

I have wandered from Prof. Francken, of whom let me take leave with many thanks and high respect. W. E. HEITLAND.

27 April, 1897.

ARISTIDES AND THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS.

I HAD occasion in the March number of the *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles* to discuss the interesting article which Professor Bury contributed to the *Classical Review* of December 1896 on some points connected with the Battle of Salamis. It will be remembered that Professor Bury supports his theory that Aristides was one of the regular strategi, in command of the land forces stationed on Salamis, by connecting his timely arrival at that island on his way from Aegina (Hdt. VIII. 79) not with his first return from exile, but with a special mission which had been sent to bring from Aegina the images of the Aeacidae. As the *Revue* is not yet widely known on this side of the Channel, it may be worth while to bring before the notice of your

readers two suggestions which I made in it on this point, the more especially as Professor Bury has kindly written to say that he accepts them.

The first is the meeting of an obvious objection. How is it, it may be asked, that Herodotus not merely fails to associate the discharge of this mission with the name of Aristides, but seems to imply that while he reached Salamis overnight, the trireme with the Aeacidae did not do so till the next morning (viii. 79, 83)?

The answer is that Aristides did not arrive till after midnight (viii. 70, 75, 76 and 81), so that the fleet in general must have already 'turned in,' and could not realise the presence of the Aeacidae till the next morning.

Thus the two events, the appearance of Aristides before the Council, and the first popular welcome given to the Heroes that were to guide to victory, would be from the outset dissociated in Herodotus' mind. Neither Aristides nor Themistocles, we may be sure, gave a thought to the Aeacidae that night. The 'See! They've come!' of the common sailors was the point of interest and the source of information.

The second point is a slight correction, a correction, however, which strengthens Professor Bury's general position, by bringing it into closer relation to Herodotus' narrative. Aristides cannot, as he thought, have had a right to take part in the Council. Only one general can have been allowed in it from each city. The Athenian system of divisional commands could not entitle them to a preponderance of voting strength. Whether or no Aristides was a strategus, he was certainly not the Athenian commander-in-chief, and we can therefore still follow Herodotus when he tells us that he was only admitted on sufferance, and withdrew as soon as the news was told (viii. 80, 81).

I may add that the only serious objection to this part of Professor Bury's theory that occurs to me is that the Aeginetans seem to have claimed credit for the subsequent achievements of the trireme which brought the Aeacidae (viii. 84), and that it is improbable that an Athenian would be put in even temporary command of an Aeginetan ship. It may be argued however that the fact that the Aeacidae were their own local Heroes would be itself enough to account for the Aeginetans' interest. If, however, as seems more probable, the ship was their own, Aristides need not have been in direct command, but may have gone under its escort as the representative of the rest of the fleet. In this case indeed we have a fine instance of the Panhellenism of the hour, of the deliberate reconciliation of Athens and Aegina in face of the common enemy.

Herodotus does not tell us in so many words whether or no it was an Aeginetan ship in any one of the three passages in which he refers to it (viii. 64, 83, 84), but it is improbable that we can found on this any valid argumentum ex silentio.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

HORRET IMPERSONAL.

IN Mr. E. W. Watson's interesting essay 'The Style and Language of St. Cyprian,' contained in vol. iv. of *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, Oxf. 1896, I read (p. 313):

'The only impersonal verb which appears first in Cyprian is:—

horret 781 18 [of Hartel's edition] *nee delectat id dicere quod aut horret aut pudet nosse*. This does not seem to be cited elsewhere; was it improvised by Cyprian for uniformity with *pudet*?'

Two Christian writers possibly were led by Cyprian to combine *horret* and *pudet*.

Cassian. inst. xii. 23 *pr. audiui in hac dumtaxat regione quod horret pudetque revolvere, quendam iuniorum, cum a suo increparctur abbate, cur humili-*

tatem, quam renuntians per modico tempore retentaret, cepisset excedere, . . . summa contumacia respondisse. . .

Oros. hist. vii. 4, 10 *referre singillatim facta eius horret pudetque*.

None of the editors of the Vienna series notice this usage in their *indices*. Indeed any arguments drawn from the silence of such an *index* are precarious to the last degree. The only remaining example which I have at hand is of course independent of Cyprian.

Ammian. xxix. 2, 15 *horret nunc reminisci quo iustitio humilitati tot rerum apices viscantur*.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

ON SOPHOCLES' *TRACHINIAE*, 781, 782.

DR. H. W. HAYLEY and myself were discussing, the other day, the difficult passage in the account of the murder of Lichas, which has come down to us in this shape:—

κόμης δὲ λευκὸν μνελὸν ἐκράνει μέσσω
κρατὸς διασπαρέντος αἵματός θ' ὀμοῦ,

and has given rise to numerous conjectures, when it occurred to us that the following

version, involving the change of three letters, would be satisfactory and probable:—

κ ο π ῆ ι δὲ λευκὸν μυελὸν ἐκράνει μέσου
κρατός, διασπαρέντος αἵματος θ ο λ ο ὦ.

κοπή is an older suggestion of Hense's; θολοῦ was found by Mr. Hayley and myself together, in such a way that it is hard for

either of us to claim it. I cannot prevail on Mr. Hayley to print this conjecture over his own signature, although we both think that it should be made known.

The adjective θολός is known from Athenaeus and lexicographers, and is implied in the verb θολόω.

F. D. ALLEN.

Harvard University, January 1897.

AUSONIUS (1) IDYL 13.

Quam longa una dies, aetas tam longa
rosarum:

Cum pubescenti iuncta senecta brevis.

or Quas pubescentis iuncta senecta premit.

Quam modo nascentem rutilus conspexit
Eous,

Hanc rediens sero vespere vidit anum.

Sed bene, quod paucis licet interitura diebus
Succedens (or *-ndens*) aevum prorogat ipsa
suum.

Collige, virgo, rosas, dum flos novus et nova
pubes,

Et memor esto aevum sic properare tuum.

In the last two lines the poet bids the maiden gather her rosebuds while she may; she is to gather her flowers betimes, while she is as yet a fairer flower than they. As in Herrick and as in Milton, so here too the notion of 'gathering roses' is bound up with the notion of 'being gathered': the poet is, in fact, playing with two ideas at once, as the remainder of his hexameter clearly shows. But what has the last couplet but one to do with these ideas? 'Rosa succedens aevum prorogat ipsa suum' means, I suppose, 'the rose-bush yields fresh roses to replace those that die.' 'Rosa' for 'rose-bush' is in itself sufficiently awkward in a poem in which the word is continually and consistently used in the sense of 'a rose.' But it is impossible after the line that precedes it, in which *interitura* has

nothing to do with a rose-bush, but only with a rose blossom.

The maiden is invited to make the most of her youth: for youth is short-lived like the rose. But, if she is to learn the lesson from the rose, the poet must have said that the rose makes the most of its youth. If she is to prolong her youth by 'gathering her flowers', that is by submitting herself to be gathered, she must be told that the rose too prolongs its life by letting itself be gathered. The thought that we require is supplied by the elegant lines of Florus on the rose:

totum lux quarta peregit
floris opus. Pereunt hodie nisi mane
leguntur;

to which an anonymous hexameter adds a sort of Scholium in these words:

ne pereant lege mane rosas: cito virgo
senescit.

Returning to our own passage, I think it will now be clear that for *Succedens* we require *Succidens*. The rose is said to prolong its own life by *cutting it short*; in other words, by allowing itself to be plucked.

E. C. MARCHANT.

NOTES ON AUSONIUS.

The following notes may be useful to future commentators. It has often been remarked with surprise how little Juvenal has been cited or copied by later authors.

The following passages in Ausonius seem reminiscences of the Satirist: and cadences in whole passages might be cited as echoes of those in his great original.

(1) Epigrammata xxxv. 9, 10.
Miremur periisse homines? Monumenta
fatiscent,
Mors etiam saxis, nominibusque venit. Cf.
Juv. x. 146.

(2) Comm: Prof. i. Tiberius Orator 17.
Dicendi torrens tibi copia. Juv. x. 9.

(3) Comm: Prof. Victorio Subdoctore xxii. 3.
Exesas tineis opicasque evolvere chartas. Juv. iii. 207.

(4) Sap. Ludius 6.
Finem intueri longae vitae quo iubes. Juv. x. 274.

(5) *Epitaphia Heroum*. xv. Astyanacti. Flos Asiae.

(6) *Monosticha de ordine* xii. Imperatorum. (12) Frater, quem Calvum dixit sua Roma Neronem. Juv. iv. 38.

(7) Ausonii villula 25. Fons propter, puteusque brevis. Juv. iii. 226.

(8) *Idyllia* iv. 46. Conditor Iliados. Juv. xi. 180.

(9) *Id.* xiii. *ad fin.* The line is quoted and the author named.
Curios simulant, et Bacchanalia vivunt. Juv. ii. 3.

(10) *Id.* xv. Votisque optata malignis.
In Epigram xl. ἀκίδννος is pronounced by accent as in modern Greek.

The following approximations to Romance seem interesting.

Epigram lxxii. 2. Testa = tête.

Gregorio epistula. Mulieres...non hae de nostro saeculo quae sponte peccant. = 'de notre siècle.'

Gratiarum Actio. O de pectore candidissimo lactei sermonis alimoniam!

He uses the following Gaulish words:—paradas, mannos, veredos.

H. A. STRONG.

A QUESTION IN ACCENTUATION.

THE personal name Deidas or Didas caused some doubt in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Pt. II. no. 294; and among the *corrigenda* at p. 353 the variation of opinion is noted between Schubart, who has Διδας in Paus. v. 21, 15 (as I have written), and Dittenberger-Purgold, who read Δειδās in the *Inscriptions of Olympia* no. 228. I notice that the same difficulty has been felt by at least one of the editors of the *Berlin Urkunde* (*Griech.*), Dr. Viereck, who in no. 78 reads Διδᾶ, but in no. 88 Δειδᾶ, without giving any explanation of his change of view—perhaps it is merely due to a slip, but, then, which accentuation represents his mature opinion? Similarly Διδᾶ no. 138

(Wilcken), but Δειδᾶ no. 155 (Krebs); apparently treating Deidas and Didas as two distinct words; but they are mere varieties of spelling. Kretschmer, I think, has Διδας in his instructive *Einl. in d. Gesch. d. gr. Spr.*; but I cannot quote the page. Pape has Διδας. The name is known in Egypt (*Berl. Urk. II. cc.* and Paus. v. 21, 15), Syrian Antioch (*Inscr. Olymp.* no. 228), Apameia of Phrygia (*Cit. and Bish.* no. 294–295), and Julia-Gordus of Lydia (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1884, p. 382). Pape mentions only the Egyptian use. Perhaps some evidence unquoted by the authorities above mentioned may be known to some reader of the *Classical Review*.

W. M. RAMSAY.

CORRECTION TO NOTE ON P. 206.

It has been pointed out by a correspondent that of the Ciceronian passages to which Prof. Mayor refers in the May number of the *Classical Review* (p. 206) the first is from Cicero's speech for Ligarius § 11, and the

second is given at the end of the text of the speech for Flaccus in the editions of C. F. W. Müller, Baiter (Orelli, ed. 2) and in some others.

DE RIDDER'S *L'IDÉE DE LA MORT*.

De l'idée de la mort en Grèce à l'époque classique, par A. DE RIDDER, Docteur ès Lettres, etc. Paris, Thorin et fils. 1897. 5 francs.

THIS tract of 200 pages is interesting, readable, and well-timed. The general proposition which it illustrates is one which, however familiar and incontestable in theory, needs constant reinforcement to keep it sufficiently before our minds. Of the religion, or even the religious ideas, which prevailed in Greece during the classical period, we must not speak, as if it or they were fixed and definite. At Athens—and it is only with reference to Athenian thought that we have information copious and continuous enough to found a history—it is a development, which we have to study, an evolution, a passing forwards, or perhaps backwards and forwards, from certain ideas to certain others quite different and even contradictory, in religion as in other departments. The 'state' of things is a term scarcely applicable. In dealing with our own times or those near to us we are apt to exaggerate differences and distinctions; in remote times, the shades and contrasts, which were of vital importance at the moment, are easily lost in the one broad opposition of which we are naturally conscious, the opposition between now and then. In spite of many formulae, we do not without effort actually realize that between the contemporaries of Aristotle and the contemporaries of Aeschylus there were differences as deep as any which separate either age from our own, as deep and for the practical purposes of the hour far more important. In religion, as in life generally, the lines of division and lines of union, upon which European thought was to be planned, were traced in Greece, and more particularly in Athens, between the epochs of Pisistratus and Alexander. M. de Ridder, starting from the true proposition that religion, in the sense commonly understood, depends for its character essentially upon the question 'What is the nature of death?', proposes to demonstrate

que sur ce point essentiel les idées des Hellènes ont changé du tout au tout dans la période même que nous étudions. La mort, d'abord tenue, ou peu s'en faut, pour complète et totale, est bientôt presque universellement regardée comme un moment de transition et comme un simple changement de l'être: par suite, la vie, d'abord principe unique d'action, tend à n'être bientôt plus que la préparation, plus ou moins directe et sérieuse, à une existence ultérieure et prochaine.

In pursuance of this plan we have a 'first part' to show the all-sufficiency of human life as conceived during the period of intense energy covered by the Persian wars and the rise of the Athenian empire, and a 'second part' on the 'tendances contraires et nouvelles', distributed between the laws and traditions relating to the disposition of the dead, the influence of individual thinkers and writers, and, most significant of all, the religions of the mysteries. In a third part, which stands to the rest in a different relation, reviewing the ground from a particular point of view, the author endeavours to point out the influence of the fundamental change as exhibited in the funeral monuments of Attica. On this sequel or appendix, which is really a little treatise in itself, those must pronounce whose acquaintance with the subject-matter is greater than mine. It is evident that here the estimation of the evidence is embarrassed by some peculiar difficulties; nor am I sure, though I would assert nothing positive, that these difficulties are practically surmountable. There are at present radical doubts as to the interpretation of the marble documents. M. de Ridder, for instance, disagrees altogether with Dr. Furtwängler as to what is represented or signified by those monuments which exhibit a group of persons, or a pair, with clasped hands. Where, and in what life, the scene of these interviews is laid, this, and other fundamental positions, are still open to debate. Then again there is the question of the artist's competence to express his meaning, and how far we can assume that it is intelligibly expressed, questions of small scope when we deal with the art of the pen, but troublesome when we turn to the chisel. So far as I can judge, the author merits in this portion the attention at any rate of competent archaeologists; this said, we will confine ourselves to the cardinal antithesis of the book, as exhibited in the two previous parts.

On the broad issues and main lines the author's account seems to be just, and is certainly expressed in a clear and instructive form. The doctrine of an after-life, if it was not newly evolved, so far as concerned Hellas, in the course of the classical period, did then for the first time assume that aspect, form, and colour which made it important and dominant in the field of morality. Of the agencies by which it was evolved, the

most active by far would appear to have been the 'mystic' cults, if we give to that somewhat vague term a sufficiently large and also a sufficiently precise signification. Whether Eleusis, in its proper function, did much, may be doubted, but the 'Bacchic' and 'Orphic' movements cover between them almost the whole operation, and achieved so much, that, without grave exaggeration, the history of Europe, down to the adoption of Christianity as the official religion of the Empire, might be described as the conversion of the Mediterranean peoples to 'Bacchism'. The general account of 'the mystic religions,' given by M. Ridder, is so well put, that, though it contains perhaps little or nothing positively new to students of Rohde and other investigators, it deserves to be quoted textually so far as space will permit:

Tout grec, pour peu qu'il fût citoyen prenait part, de plein droit, aux sacrifices offerts aux dieux de la cité. Le rituel exigeait bien que certains actes solennels fussent réservés aux prêtres, mais ces prêtres étaient et des magistrats et des citoyens; de plus, leurs actes étaient publics. Les sectes mystiques recueillaient partout leurs adhérents, sans conditions civiques ni droits exclusifs. . . . Enfin leurs cérémonies étaient secrètes. . . . *Originalité plus grande encore, ces religions mystiques avaient, pour la plupart, un dogme, si imparfait d'ailleurs et si grossier qu'il fût. Qui sacrifiait à Zeus ou à Héra, n'avait pas besoin de se faire de Zeus ou d' Héra une idée déterminée. . . .* Par contre on n'était pas libre de croire ou ne pas croire aux religions mystiques. Qui se faisait initié était d'abord éprouvé, puis instruit. . . . Une dernière différence était que ces doctrines, distinctes entre elles, se ressemblaient en ce qu'elles étaient mystiques. Honorer les divinités de la cité était s'assurer de leur protection, ou était tout au moins un moyen d'éviter leur malveillance. Mais l'adorant avait beau faire les dieux à son image, il se sentait loin des êtres auxquels il sacrifiait. Le culte ni diminuait ni n'augmentait la distance; c'était un moyen de plaire, une simple demande faite aux dieux. *Au contraire, les religions mystiques tendaient à rapprocher l'homme de la divinité. L'idéal était d'élever et de soulever l'être humain, de le transporter d'un enthousiasme divin, de faire qu'il s'exaltât au point de devenir Dieu. Rien n'était plus que cette conception opposée au culte officiel et populaire. Rien aussi n'importe davantage à notre étude.*

It is indeed obvious that the possibility of receiving such doctrines as are here outlined must depend absolutely upon a corresponding conception of the human soul, of its separation from mortality, of its affinity to the immortal, its essential immortality; and on the other hand that from such conceptions of the soul and of death, religious doctrines substantially identical with those of 'the mystic religions' would necessarily grow. The field of M. de Ridder's investigation is really co-extensive with that of these religions and their diffusion, perhaps more exactly coincident than the form of the tract

would suggest. But at all events the chapter devoted to them specially is worthy of its beginning, and presents the matter in a trustworthy and serviceable way.

It would be scarcely fair to criticise minutely the chapter on 'the philosophers and authors.' If we must compress into sixteen pages an account of what is to be found, bearing on the general problem of life and death, in philosophy from Protagoras to Plato inclusive, and in literature from Aeschylus to Euripides inclusive, we cannot have completeness, or even exactness, more especially when allowance is made for the fact that the authors themselves, even the most elaborate and systematic, cannot be pinned to a fixed and absolutely consistent opinion. Plato, says M. de Ridder, 'has strictly banished from the soul every element of matter, everything which pertains to body and the imperfections of existence upon earth.'

Sans doute, sur la terre et dans la vie l'être individuel est complexe. L'énergie et l'activité (τὸ θυμωειδές) lui viennent de ce qu'il est double, à la fois pensée et corps, idée et matière. . . . Aussi l'esprit ne survit pas plus que le courage à l'union de l'âme et du corps. Le seul élément qui ne périsse pas, le seul être véritable de l'âme, sa substance et son tout, c'est la faculté qu'elle a de raisonner.

This is perhaps as true to Plato as the limits permit, and sufficiently true for the purpose of the treatise; yet the gaps in the statement, as an exposition of Platonism, are plain enough. But in truth neither Plato nor Platonism, nor any of the great doctors, had very much to do with the revolution which concerns M. de Ridder, the revolution which, once launched, never stayed till it had destroyed and rebuilt the whole of the European world. The future, for better or for worse, was not with the schools, nor even with the theatre, but with certain obscure little congregations and *cenacula*, of which neither drama nor lecture had much to tell, which assembled obstinately, by night, if it might not be by day, in the hills, if it might not be in the market-place, to receive the instruction of a *bacchus*, (or whatever name might be most in vogue for the divinified man), to perform the *hora*, and through the innate capacity of their own spirits, to become themselves *bacchi* and divine, even now and here, but in expectation of that time when 'the journey' should be accomplished, 'the haven' reached, and the initiate joined for ever to the rites of the blest.

It is no fault of M. de Ridder, but on the contrary, a proof of his true historical sense,

that of his 'second part,' which deals nominally with 'tendencies contrary' to the ancient Hellenic views of life 'and new', not a little is given to showing us that the tendencies in question were not precisely new, but grew out of seeds long planted, which now had found their spring. Shadowy and unreal as was the world of the dead to the Greek of the earliest historical age, there was and had been for ages an abundance of practices which depended for their meaning on the supposition that the dead person was *something*, nay, a power. To the sections upon 'the worship of the dead,' 'the fear of the dead,' 'heroes,' and 'Hades,' there is in general little to object. But upon one point the author, as it appears to me, lays down principles which, if not altogether without foundation, go far beyond the warranty. Curiously enough, and creditably rather for the candour of the author, the effect of this exaggeration is to diminish, not to increase, the apparent importance of the revolution which he desires to signalize. Manifestly, the larger the function performed in Greek life, before the classical epoch, by supposed personal activity and power residing in the souls of the dead, the less the importance of that development in popular thought, by which the 'after-world' became real and significant to the inhabitants of this. Now, according to M. de Ridder, that function governed, among other things, nothing less than the whole theory and practice of the highest criminal justice. Trial and punishment for murder, according to him, rested, in the conception of the Greeks, essentially upon the necessity of respecting the will of the dead:

Le principe est l'essentiel, et comme nous l'avons vu, ce principe est très net : la sentence est ou doit être l'expression de la volonté du mort (p. 73).

The wide bearing of this proposition, if true, upon the whole evolution of Hellenic society and thought, is sufficiently manifest. But what is the proof of it? Really it seems that there is substantially no evidence at all. That the alleged evidence is almost confined to the one case of Athens is not perhaps the fault of the author. In all 'Hellenic' questions we are but too likely to find ourselves no better provided. But what is the evidence from Athens? Practically nothing else, if we do not misunderstand, but that the chief Athenian murder court, the Areopagus, was closely connected, by its place of sitting, with 'the sanctuary of the Erinyes,' and that 'the Erinyes' were evolved, as persons, from a more vague

conception of 'avenging spirits,' that is to say, of the dead themselves regarded as avengers. This latter proposition is undoubtedly true, and the evidence for it is well stated by M. de Ridder (pp. 87 foll.); the 'three Furies' of poetic mythology, with their snakes and other attributes, were an invention of historical times; and the first beginning of them, so far as the existing materials enable us to judge, can hardly be traced beyond Aeschylus. But, given that primitively an 'Erinyes' was virtually a self-avenging ghost, we are still no nearer to the conclusion that the functions of the Areopagus, as a court of murder, were based upon duty towards ghosts, unless it can further be proved that the court, by origin and tradition, owed especial duty to 'Erinyes.' As a matter of fact, it is more than doubtful whether, before the famous drama of Aeschylus, 'Erinyes' or 'the Erinyes' had the slightest connexion with the court, except (upon one single legendary occasion) in the capacity of suitors. They were said to have prosecuted Orestes there; but that the court was first instituted for this purpose was not alleged; on the contrary the origin of the court was connected with Ares and the name of the hill, by a story which Aeschylus (to make room for his new view) has to displace and contradict. Nor were the 'Erinyes' worshipped there, either by the court or by its suitors. There was close by a certain cavern-sanctuary, dedicated to the 'good fairies' of Attica, who bore, like other such powers, a mysterious name, that of the *Semnai*. That the court, and those who underwent trial there, paid respect to these powers, as local powers, followed as a matter of course, according to the spirit of Hellenic observances, from the fact of their local presence, and needs no explanation to be sought in the function of the tribunal. Aeschylus, who, for certain political reasons and for still more powerful reasons connected with his theological belief and religious feelings, was bent on the conversion of all 'Erinyes' to gentleness and subordination, chose to assert, not indeed in terms but by manifest spectacular implication, that 'the Erinyes,' whom for this very purpose he endowed with a fixed and limited individualities such as before they had never possessed, were in some mysterious manner identifiable with these local *Semnai* or 'good fairies.' That the legendary and traditional conception of the respective powers afforded any ground for this the play itself would hardly allow us to believe; nor is there any external proof of it. Nor did the identification succeed, so

far at least as concerned the local usage. The Furies of the dramatist had indeed a prodigious literary and artistic success, giving birth to a whole train of poetry and art. But the 'Semnai' did not become 'Erinyes'; they did not even become 'Euménides'; they remained the 'Semnai'. A modern author, dominated by the great drama and its sequel of associations, may write 'Les trois hiéropes des *Erinyes* étaient choisis parmi les membres [de l'Aréopage], et chaque partie invoquait, avant de plaider, l'assistance des *Euménides*,' and may refer us without suspicion to 'Demosthenes 21, 115.' But if we turn to the Greek, we read simply, *περιεῖδε δὲ τοῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἱεροποιὸν αἰρεθέντα ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων τρίτον αὐτὸν καὶ καταρξάμενον τῶν ἱερῶν*. What proof is here that the local deities of the cavern were conceived by this orator as avengers of murder or as personifications of ghosts, or as 'Euménides,' at all, not to say as 'Erinyes', or that, even if in those days the not very numerous readers of Aeschylus may sometimes have applied his conception to real life, that conception had already been established at the epoch when the council of Athens began to sit as a court for murder upon 'Ares' Hill'? When it has been shown that the 'Semnai' of the Areopagus (not the 'Erinyes') were originally or ever conceived as ghosts, one step at least will have been taken towards establishing, for Athens, a special connexion between the duty of the state to repress murder and obligation towards the spirits of the dead. At present it does not appear that this obligation was more important to the Hellenic law of homicide than to any other. It may, perhaps, have had some influence, in Hellas as elsewhere; but we are far indeed from the 'well-marked and essential principle' that 'the sentence (of the court) expresses or should express the will of the dead.'

Let us hasten to add that the exaggeration (to say the least) in this matter is by no means characteristic of the author. In general he uses his evidence quite legitimately. A few queries marked in passing may be noticed rapidly. The statement concerning those who die in battle that 'seuls en effet ils sont enterrés dans la terre paternelle' (p. 32) does not stand very firmly upon 'Aeschylus, *Agam.* 511-2.' On p. 38 the question 'what epitaph the Greeks can put

upon the tomb of Astyanax?' (*Eur. Tro.* 1188) is assigned by a slip of the pen to Astyanax himself. The 'envie' (*φθόνος*) which according to *Eur. El.* 29, deters Clytaemnestra from putting Electra to death is surely not specially, or at all, the fear of her ghost. It is the fear of the *vox populi*, and, in a secondary way, of the gods. Is it certain or probable that (p. 90) the Harpies, the Gorgons, and the Sirens 'représentaient la vengeance des morts'? The ghosts, at this rate, threaten to become as rapacious in mythology as the Sun. That 'le drame sortit de la religion dionysiaque' is doubtless a commonplace of school-tradition ancient and modern, and must, as would seem, be true in some sense. But in what sense, and whether the proposition, rightly understood and limited, would have much to do with 'Dionysiac religion' in its true essence, as properly understood by M. de Ridder, may be doubted. 'Si Hérakles ose affronter vivant les ténèbres d'Hades, c'est qu'il est initié (*Eur. Hérakles* 611-613)' (p. 140). It seems that in this case the *mystae*, whose sacred emblems Heracles saw, were themselves celebrating their rites in Hades. However a like grace could no doubt have been attributed to the rites of this world. The author (p. 142) seems disposed to deny or minimise any sacramental or symbolic meaning in the rites of Eleusis. That Aristophanes understood them, or some of them, sacramentally, appears to me certain from the *Δήμητερ, ἡ θρέψασα τὴν ἐμὴν φρένα* which he put into the mouth of Aeschylus. But the obscurity of the whole subject probably comes in no small part from the fact that the worshippers saw and interpreted according to their various tendencies, and that there was no efficient tribunal of orthodoxy.

To return however in conclusion to the main proposition. We must agree with M. de Ridder in thinking that, during the classical age of Greece, certain tendencies, some of them new, some of them old as time but revived and modified by the hour, produced a revolution in religion. That revolution was not less important to the history of Europe than the other innovations of that extraordinary age. And the author's account of it, whatever questions may be raised upon points of detail, is true, fresh, and interesting.

A. W. VERRALL.

HUNZIKER ON THE FIGURE HYPERBOLE IN VIRGIL.

RUDOLF HUNZIKER, *Die Figur der Hyperbel in den Gedichten Vergils*. Berlin, Mayer und Müller, 1896. M. 3.60.

THAT Latin is a rhetorical language, and that Virgil is an extremely rhetorical poet, may be assumed to be pretty well known, but it has perhaps never been so convincingly brought home to us than by Mr. Hunziker in the book the title of which has been printed at the top of this article. His method is lucid and simple. Beginning with the definition of a hyperbole, he divides hyperboles into those of distance, multitude, sound, mass, etc., and then gathers the places of Virgil where they occur, whilst the passage in Homer which gave rise to the hyperbole, is mentioned, and several other writers, ancient and modern, are quoted. Regarding the latter, it would appear that quoting a modern author in editing classics, is considered somewhat of a sin in Germany, as is borne out by the curious note on p. 72, where the author with respect to a commentary of Ludwig-Schaper on *Aen.* ix. 422, containing a quotation from Ossian's *Fingal*, makes the following remark: 'Warum dies aber weder in der Ursprache noch mit genauer Angabe der betreffenden Stelle geschieht, ist mir unerklärlich und zeigt, wie es—grundlos genug—vielfach noch für eine Sünde angesehen wird, den heiligen Apparat der classischen Parallelen in Schulausgaben mit moderner Zutat zu "verunreinigen!"' Let us hope this is an 'überwundener Standpunkt' in other countries!

The author gives evidence of wide and varied reading, which may be proved by the fact that he quotes not only from the classics, ancient and modern, in a narrower sense, but also from authors like Claudianus, Columella, Manilius, Silius, Valerius, Apollonius Rhodius, Musaeus, Ronsard, Ariosto, Tasso, Camoëns, Geibel, Grillparzer, Hebbel, Kleist, Leuthold, Tegnér, Byron, and Ossian.

A few striking instances of Virgil's love of exaggeration are e.g. *Aen.* i. 498 sqq. compared with § 105 sq.; *Georg.* iii. 541 sqq. containing no less than three hyperboles; *Aen.* xii. 899 sq. compared with E 302 sqq. and M 445 sqq. (in Homer the ancient heroes sling stones which no two men of latter times, οἱ οὐδὲν βροτοὶ εἶσι, would suffice to carry; in Apollonius Rhodius four of

these would be required; in Virgil no less than twelve!); and *Aen.* iii. 567, with which majestic hyperbole the opening lines of Shakespeare's *Othello* ii. 1 are compared. Furthermore in the book about the bees, *Georg.* iv., all sorts of high-flown and high-sounding expressions are often used, without their being in harmony with the subject of the poem. One should, however, not judge too rashly, it being sometimes doubtful whether exaggeration exists or not, as is proved by notes 82 and 87, respectively on pp. 60 and 62.

As has been observed, the author begins with a short treatise on the hyperbole. The object and matter by which a hyperbole is called forth, must possess 'an sich' something grand, powerful and extraordinary, and the poet or orator must prepare it, so to say. The various definitions of the Greek and Roman rhetors and grammarians, Gregorius Corinthius, Georgios ὁ χοροβοσκός (probably a kind of lettered Eumaïos), Kokondrios, Diomedes, Pompeius, Beda, Cicero, Julius Rufinianus et hoc genus omne, are weighed and found too light. They are all more or less at sea concerning the question of hyperboles.

The explanations given by Quintilianus, G. Hermann and G. Gerber are *melioris notae*. The chief characteristic of an hyperbole consists in exceeding the limits of truth, not with the purpose to tell falsehoods, but for the sake of making impression, of inciting the imagination. A felicitous and tastefully chosen hyperbole enhances the reader's pleasure. The conclusion, drawn by the author for the (allowed) hyperbole, is given as follows: 'Die Hyperbel ist eine an die Phantasie des Hörers (oder Lesers) appellirende, für ihn aber als solche erkennbare Uebertreibung (Steigerung) der Wahrheit, die vom Sprechenden (oder Autor) mit der bestimmten Absicht, der Ausdrucksweise Schmuck oder Kraft zu verleihen, angewendet wird, und die sowohl in ihrer Qualität als auch in der Quantität ihrer Anwendung den Gesetzen der Aesthetik unterliegt.'

Concerning the question whether the hyperbole belongs to the tropes or the figures, the author decides in general in favour of the latter. When employing a trope, we enter a new sphere of thought; the hyperbole remains in the same sphere, but this is raised to a higher level. If with the trope the proportion of the ideas is $a : b$,

it is with the hyperbole $a : a^n$. Now and then, however, when the hyperbole occurs as metaphor or as comparison, the proportion may be, like this, $a : b^n$.

After this the division of hyperboles is treated, and the opinions of Trypho, Cornificius, Quintilianus, Demetrius, Weisse, G. Hermann,¹ Gotschall, Beyer, and others are mustered, whilst the *ἐμφασις*, *αὐξησις*, *ὁμοίωσις*, and *μειωσις* are commented upon, as well as the conscious and unconscious hyperboles, the naïve (Homer) and artificial ones (Virgil). As contributions to the study of hyperboles the author mentions J. Egli, *Die Hyperbel in den Komödien des Plautus und in Cicero's Briefen an Atticus*; J. Franke, *De Siliii Italici Punicorum tropis*; Spangeberg, *De Lucretii Cari tropis*; F. Dressler, *De troporum qui dicuntur apud Catullum usu*; M. Hansen, *De tropis et figuris apud Tibullum*; and H. Gebbing, *De Valerii Flacci tropis et figuris*, whilst the monographs of W. Barchfeld (Silius), L. Genther (Iuvenalis), C. H. Müller (old elegiac poets), W. Pecz' *Beiträge zur vergleichenden Tropik der Poesie, Teil I. Aeschylus, Sophocles und Euripides*, and H. Schmaus' *Tacitus ein Nachahmer Vergils* have been of use to him and have furnished him parallels. Likewise, he is indebted to two works by Oscar Brosin, *Parallelstellen aus modernen Dichtern zu Vergils Aeneis* and *Anklänge an Vergil bei Schiller* and to P. Lange's *Ueber Ronsard Franciade und ihr Verhältnis zu Vergils Aeneis*.

It is, of course, impossible to deal separately with all the places quoted by the author; I shall only mention where I do not agree with him, and where I think I am able to supply him with another instance or comparison. For the sake of gaining space, I shall not quote all passages *totidem verbis*, but only point out where they may be found. If needed, I intend to be more circumstantial.

The explanation of χ 304 given on p. 44, 'sich zu Wolken, d. h. dichtgedrängten Schwärmen duckend,' is in my opinion very hazardous—ingeniosius quam verius. When treating of this place in my dissertation *Studia Tragico-Homerica*, s.v. *ἄγρη* p. 52 sq., I have quoted the commendable conjecture of Prof. Van Leeuwen:

τῶν μὲν τ' ἐν πεδίῳ νέφεα πρόσσονται φέεσθαι.

As an instance of the use of *horre* and *horrescere* of arms like a *seges*, the verse of Eunius 'sparsis hastis longis campus splendet et horret' might have been mentioned, as well as *Georg.* i. 314, whilst besides N 339

¹ In his *Dissertatio de Hyperbola*.

some space might have been given to Δ 281 sq. and ψ 599.

To the blood-hyperboles on pp. 49 and 50 may be added Shakesp. *Macb.* ii. 2, 60 sqq., *Jul. Caes.* iii. 1, 105 sqq., and *Rich.* II. iii. 3, 43; to the tear-hyperboles Eur. *Alc.* 183 sq., Shakesp. *Lear* iv. 6, 199 sqq., *Tit. Andr.* iii. 2, 17 sqq., *King John* iii. 1, 22 sq., *Rich.* II. iii. 3, 162, *Rom. and Jul.* i. 1, 139, and *Lov. Compl.* 7. Where an ocean or a sea of troubles, injuries, calamities is spoken of, the following instances may be compared: Shakesp. *Hamlet* iii. 1, 59, *Pericles* v. 1, 194, and *Henry VIII.* iii. 2, 360; whilst in *Oth.* i. 3, 159 there occurs 'a world of sighs' and in *Cymb.* iv. 2, 391 'a century of prayers... twice o'er.' In W. Morris' *Earthly Paradise*, 'The Story of Cupid and Psyche' we read:

Thou hast been tried, and cast away all
blame
Into the sea of woes that thou dost bear.

On p. 55 a parallel to *Aen.* vi. 305 sqq. may be found in Milton, *P.L.* i. 298 sqq., where the hosts of hell are compared to the autumnal leaves that strew the brooks in Vallombrosa, whilst in the verses immediately following they are compared to 'scattered sedge | Afloat when with fierce wind Orion armed | Hath vexed the Red Sea coast.'

The author declares ι 51 non-hyperbolical, which I venture to doubt.

In the same way I should like to put a sign of interrogation after most of his instances on p. 57. Does the author really think that these are all hyperboles consciously and purposely employed? To quote an instance from p. 58, *Buc.* i. 11 sq. There *totis* is considered a hyperbole; but I dare say that by *totis agris* we should understand all the fields in Meliboeus' surroundings, all the fields he knows of. The same remark is applicable to more instances on this page.

To the mountain-hyperboles the author might have added Shakesp. *Com. of Err.* iv. 4, extr., where 'a mountain of mad flesh' is spoken of, and *Henry IV.* ii. 4, 269, where Falstaff is called 'this huge hill of flesh.' Those who wish to read some amusing scolding-hyperboles, may find them in the second act of *Troilus and Cressida*. As to the passage where Polyphemus is compared to a wooded mountain-top and passages of the same nature, we may call attention to Milton's *P.L.* i. 589 sqq., where Satan stands 'proudly eminent' above the others, like

a tower. With *Aen.* vii. 528 *sqq.* compare Shakesp. *Henry IV.*¹ iii. 1, 21 *sqq.* and *Oth.* ii. 1, 92, and with *Aen.* x. 318, Hom. H 141. Why does not the author, in dealing with the peculiar use of *πέρουαι*, compare Soph. *At.* 693 and *Ant.* 1307? Where the hyperbole 'swifter than the wind' is spoken of, we may mention Shakesp. *Ven. and Ad.* 678 *sqq.* (cp. Shelley's short song from the Arabic, commencing: 'My faint spirit was sitting in the light') and where the ether and the clouds are treated of (p. 90), the opening lines of Shelley's *Sky-lark* might have been compared, as well as 'The Ettrick Shepherd's' lines on the same bird: 'Wild is thy lay and loud | Far in the downy cloud'...and 'Thy lay is in heaven, thy love is on earth.' Similar apostrophes to the skylark are as follows: 'Ethereal Minstrel! Pilgrim of the sky!' (Wordsworth); 'Songster of sky and cloud' (Barton); and 'Ere yet the shadows fly, he mounted sings | Amid the dawning clouds...' (Thomson, *Spring*).¹ To the hyperboles of sound may be added 'All the earth and air | With thy voice is loud' (Shelley, *Sky-lark*, str. 5), and to the hyperboles of thunder: Burns' *Jolly Beggars*: 'To rattle the thundering drum was his trade,' Dryden's *Power of Music*: 'the thundering drum,' and Shakesp. *King John* v. 2, 173, where the sound of the drum will 'mock the deep-mouth'd thunder,' with which passage compare *Coriol.* i. 4, 59.

Georg. ii. 324 and 364 are not so very hyperbolic in my opinion, whilst 336—339 impress one as a fantasy, in which the hyperbole does no harm to the passage, on the contrary, it enhances its power and significance.

To *Aen.* v. 695 *sq.* might have been added *Ov. Met.* xi. 517, and to *Aen.* iii. 564 *sq.* *Ov. Met.* xi. 502 *sqq.* The quotations from Silius on p. 111 may be augmented with xv. 681.

A double hyperbole of whiteness and smoothness (p. 114) occurs in Shakesp. *Oth.* v. 2, 3 *sqq.*

To the hyperboles of affection may be added Horace's 'O et praesidium et dulce decus meum,' and with the Latin *lux* in the sense of *bliss, salvation*, may be compared Hom. π 23 and ρ 41, besides Soph. *El.* 1224.

In mentioning *ἀποθνήσκειν* (p. 124) in a figurative sense, the author might have called attention to the Latin expressions *deperire animam* and *taedio animae enecare*,

¹ Cp. Shakesp. Song in *Cymbeline*: 'Hark! hark! the lark at heaven's gate sings' and Sonnet XXIX.

whilst on p. 125 in dealing with *Buc.* i. 38 *sq.* and Theocr. iv. 12, Moschos' *Epitaphium Bionis*, as well as Milton's *Lycidas* and Shelley's *Adonais* might have supplied the author with parallels.

Perhaps the author had better left untouched one of the most difficult lines in the *Aeneid*, viz. iv. 436, that real *crux interpretum*. The explanation quoted from Koch's *Lexicon*, p. 115, is in my opinion as unsatisfying as all the others I know of. Amongst the hyperboles of scoffing and jesting on p. 132, I think Hom. σ 106 may be named, where in the jeering and scornful *κοίπας* a note of comic exaggeration is sounded; and to *Aen.* ix. 414 similar scenes from Ovid (e.g. the fight between Perseus and Phineus, and between the Lapithae and Centaurs) might have been added.

In dealing with *occidere* (*Aen.* xi. 413) the use of *perii* might have been commented upon, and Soph. *At.* 896 have been adduced as a parallel.

According to the author (p. 140) *Georg.* ii. 172 contains a greater compliment to the Indians than to the Romans, but may we not assume *imbellem* to be used here proleptically?

In order not to overtax the reader's patience, I shall abstain from further particulars, and only add that at the end of his book the author gives an aesthetic appreciation of Virgil's epic, in which he states as his opinion that its merits have been often overvalued, and that it stands far beneath Homer's *Iliad*. I dare say Mr. Hunziker is in the main right, when he judges Virgil as follows on p. 143: 'In dem richtigen, aber vielleicht unbewussten Gefühle, dass ihm wirkliche epische Begabung fehle, hat Vergil eine ganz besondere Sorgfalt auf die Sprache verwendet; er wollte seine Schwächen durch das ausgefeilte Pathos verdecken, und so schwelgt er in einer pathetisch gehobenen Diction, um möglichst episch zu erscheinen, tut aber dabei meiner Ansicht nach des Guten viel zu viel, so dass man seine Redeweise oft mit Recht schwülstig, unklar, übertrieben und daher langweilig nennen kann; wir sehnen uns bei der Lectüre der Aeneis zurück zu dem einfachen Heldengesang Homers, der von echt künstlerischer—und nicht künstlicher Schönheit durchtränkt ist, und der nie durch eine grossrednerische Sprache das Fehlen eines bedeutenden Inhalts bemänteln muss.'

EDWARD B. KOSTER.

The Hague, Holland.

CARTAUTL ON VIRGIL'S *BUCOLICS*.

Étude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile, par A.

CARTAUTL, professeur de la poésie latine à l'Université de Paris. Paris: Colin. Pp. viii. + 507, small 8. 5 francs.

M. CARTAUTL divides his subject into thirteen chapters. In the first two he discusses the early life and friends of Virgil and the chronology of the *Eclogues*: he then devotes one chapter to each *Eclogue* in turn and concludes with a thirteenth on the 'rustic realities' of the poems. His object is not to describe the broad literary aspects of the *Eclogues* but to examine them minutely somewhat in the manner of a commentator: he requires his readers to keep the text of Virgil before them for frequent reference, and he enumerates recent German theories with something very like German fulness. His book is not meant to be read continuously, like, for instance, Mr. Sellar's *Virgil* but to be consulted by close students of the *Eclogues*.

It may be consulted, I believe, with much profit. M. Cartault combines literary taste, scholarship, knowledge, and sound judgment, and his pages are interesting and suggestive. He is at his best, perhaps, when he is indicating the relation of Virgil to Theocritus, and one wishes that he had somewhere collected into one chapter the remarks on this subject which are at present scattered up and down his book. He deals ably, too, with the German views which he enumerates—with the result (as might have been expected) that most of them are found to be untenable. I am not sure that all these theories really deserved discussion: many are so arbitrary that they are best left alone. But M. Cartault's conspectus of them has a certain, perhaps a melancholy, interest, and it is well done.

I pass on to notice one or two points about which I am not in agreement with M. Cartault. In the first place, he accepts the theory that Virgil, like other poets, composed various fragments on chance occasions and used them afterwards when writing complete *Eclogues*. The idea is natural and attractive: the difficulty seems to me to arise when it is applied to any individual case. For example, M. Cartault holds that a passage in the ninth *Eclogue* (vv. 46–50),

ecce, Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum

and its context, were written at the moment when the *Iulium sidus* actually appeared in 44, and were utilized for the ninth *Eclogue*

in 38 or 39. The suggestion is interesting, for it makes out that Vergil was a Caesarian in 44, and not, like Horace, a late convert; but I do not see how it can possibly be proved. The lines plainly refer to an event of 44, but that event had plainly not been forgotten in 38 or whenever the *eclogue*, as a whole, was composed: they might therefore have been written when the rest of the *Eclogue* was written, and I can detect no reason for supposing that they were not written at that time. M. Cartault's hypothesis, therefore, is superfluous, and is devoid of confirmatory evidence; it is simply possible and nothing more. I hasten to add that M. Cartault rarely indulges in such a hypothesis and that when I protest against it, I do not mean to imply that it is characteristic of his volume.

I take a different kind of point for my next criticism. M. Cartault comments on a well-known difficulty in the first *Eclogue*

rapidum Cretae veniemus Oaxen.

He is inclined to read by conjecture *ad axem* for *oaxen*, but he is ready to accept *Cretae*, which seems to me inadmissible. The context states that the exiled speaker and his companions in misfortune will go to Britain or Scythia or the Sahara, that is to the outskirts of the world known to the Romans. It is absurd to append to these places the island of Crete. M. Cartault observes that 'il n'est pas plus extraordinaire d'aller en Crète que d'aller en Bretagne,' but I think he wrote the sentence in haste. Britain was to the Roman of Virgil's day proverbially one of the ends of the earth: Crete was close to Italy and a Roman Province: the two are absolutely dissimilar. Whatever, then, be the right explanation of the line, *Cretae* must be wrong. There is, on the other hand, a well-attested reading, *rapidum cretae*, and there is a river Oaxes in the East, apparently in Scythia, and it is simplest to accept these facts or to confess ignorance. Conjecture is very unlikely to help us here, or, indeed, in most parts of Virgil.

I would not, however, be supposed to be criticising M. Cartault's book unfavourably, because of the two preceding paragraphs. It contains much in detail which is acceptable or at least stimulating, and I hope that it will receive from Virgilian scholars the attention which I believe it to deserve.

F. HAVERFIELD.

RIDLEY'S TRANSLATION OF LUCAN'S *PHARSALIA*.

The Pharsalia of Lucan, translated into blank verse by EDMUND RIDLEY, Q.C.¹ Longmans, 1896, pp. xviii. 334. 14s.

It is somewhat of a paradox that the year of grace 1896 should have brought to the birth a verse translation of the *Pharsalia*. But Mr. Ridley's poetical manner is not that of his contemporaries and recalls the eighteenth much more than the nineteenth century. So far well. He has not adopted the rhymed couplet of Dryden and Pope; but in that his choice appears to be, in the abstract, right. There are, it is true, passages whose double antithesis rebels against all the efforts of a blank verse translation. Such a passage is the famous

magno se iudice quisque tuetur;
victrix causa deis placuit sed victa Catoni,
rendered by Mr. Ridley,
'Each for his cause can vouch a judge
supreme,
'The victor, heaven; the vanquished, Cato,
thee,'

where a less inadequate version would be,
For either cause a judge most high can
boast,
Heaven for the conquering, Cato for the
lost.²

But after all, translation in verse is but a choice of sacrifices; and the translator who takes upon himself the chains of rhyme pays a heavy price for their glitter and clang. For the rest, it will be well to begin by giving a specimen of the rendering where it is most successful. I will take this from the episode of the Witch of Thessaly in book VI:

Angered at Death the witch, and at the
pause
Conceded by the fates, with living snake
Scourges the moveless corse; and on the
dead
She barks through fissures gaping to her
song,

¹ Appointed, since this review was written, one of Her Majesty's judges.

² I should at once say that the versions of my own which here and there in this article I have appended to my criticisms of Mr. Ridley are not designed to be corrections of his translation, to which in many cases they could not be applied, still less as model renderings, but to indicate more briefly than description could do the points at which I think a translator of the passages should aim.

Breaking the silence of their gloomy home:
'Tisiphone, Megera, heed ye not?
'Flies not this wretched soul before your
whips
'The void of Erebus? By your very
names
'She-dogs of hell, I'll call you to the day,
'Not to return; through sepulchres and
death
'Your gaoler: from funereal urns and tombs
'I'll chase you forth. And thou, too,
Hecate,
'Who to the gods in comely shape and
mien,
'Not that of Erebus, appearst, henceforth
'Wasted and pallid as thou art in hell
'At my command shalt come. I'll noise
abroad
'The banquet that beneath the solid earth
'Holds thee, thou maid of Enna; by what
bond
'Thou lov'st night's king, by what mysteri-
ous stain
'Infected, so that Ceres fears from hell
'To call her daughter. And for thee, base
king,
'Titan shall pierce thy caverns with his
rays
'And sudden day shall smite thee. Do ye
hear?
'Or shall I summon to mine aid that god
'At whose dread name earth trembles; who
can look
'Unflinching on the Gorgon's head, and
drive
'The Furies with his scourge, who holds the
depths
'Ye cannot fathom, and above whose haunts
'Ye dwell supernal; who by waves of Styx
'Forswears himself unpunished?'

There are undoubtedly faults in this version. The fifth line dilutes the original 'regnique silentia rumpit' too much. It may be doubted whether an ordinary English reader would understand the Latinism in 'Flies...the void of Erebus' for 'Flies over the void'; the same perhaps may be said of 'very names' which is to be the opposite of 'assumed names.' The sense of 'per busta seque, per funera custos' has been missed; and I think it would hardly be inferred from the now conventional expression 'earth trembles' that the utterance of the dread name produced an earthquake. But taken as a whole the passage

is well rendered; and if the same level had been maintained throughout, we should have before us a good translation of the *Pharsalia*.

This however is not the case. The chief cause would appear to be that Mr. Ridley has not fully and consciously realized the scope and conditions of the work. A translation of Latin poetry into English can never afford to neglect the fact that the difference between prosaic and poetical expression is far greater in the modern than in the ancient language. The Roman poets were well aware of the difficulties which their language threw in the path of the Muse, when they tried every expedient, legitimate or illegitimate, to differentiate her utterance from the *sermo pedestris*. 'Hordea qui dixit superest ut tritica dicat' is a severe, though a just stricture, upon the devices adopted for this purpose by even the more illustrious of Roman poetical writers. Plurals like *mella*, collective singulars like *cadaver* are of course untranslatable; but the version which, *without compensation*, suppresses them, is unfaithful to the style of its original. When we turn to metre, we find the case reversed. Every one is aware that English prosaists often drop unconsciously into blank verse; but a hexameter in the Roman orators and historians is a veritable phenomenon. Modern verse has called in the aid of rhyme to supplement the deficiencies of metre; and if rhyme be dispensed with, its place must be taken by a mastery over the simple metre which but few can claim. Wherever then a version in its language and in its handling of an unrhyming metre fails to reproduce relatively the distance between poetry and prose, it must be pronounced poetically inadequate; and this I fear is the case with much of Mr. Ridley's work. There is however a great deal in Lucan which in respect of thought and expression cannot be distinguished from prose, and here we can only require from the translator the prosewriter's merits of vehemence, vigour and epigram. It must be confessed that here too Mr. Ridley's translation leaves a good deal to be desired.

These criticisms may now be illustrated by extracts. In book II. of the Marian massacres Lucan has (104 *sqq.*)

nulli sua profruit aetas :
non senis extremum piguit uergentibus
annis
praecipitasse diem, nec primo in limine uitae
infantis miseri nascentia rumpere fata'

'No age found pity : men of failing years,
Just tottering to the grave, were hurled to
death.

From infants, in their being's earliest dawn,
The growing life was severed.'

Now if this is the best that can be done with Lucan in English, Mr. Ridley has condemned himself from the first to plough the sand; for no one would read it. But Ben Jonson's imitation, which is quoted in Mr. Ridley's footnote, indicates the truer method:

Cethegus.—Not infants in the porch of life
were free.

Lucan says of the Caesarians asleep after the battle of Pharsalia 'capuloque manus absente mouentur' (VII. 767). This is translated:

'The guilty hand
Still wrought its deeds of blood, and restless
sought
The absent sword-hilt¹.'

Now apart from the mistranslation of 'mouentur,' which appears to come from Haskins' note, the literalism of 'absent swordhilt' fails completely to convey the weird effect, involved in the Latin expression, of an action severed from its object; compare Virgil's famous phrase 'illum *absens absentem* auditque uidetque.' We might propose,

The sword-hand sways,
Clutching a hilt of dreams.

Further on we read

'No lowing kine should graze, nor shepherd
dare
To leave his fleecy charge to browse at will
On fields made fertile by our mouldering
dust;
All bare and unexplored thy soil should lie
As past man's footsteps, parched by cruel
suns,
Or palled² snows unmelting!'

This is to translate

gregibus dumeta carerent
nullusque auderet pecori permittere pastor,
uellere surgentem de nostris ossibus herbam,
ac uelut impatiens hominum, uel solis iniqui
limite uel glacie, nuda atque ignota iaceres.

¹ Italics are of course mine.

Little fault can be found with the last words if we allow that this is the place to render *glacie* by three-fifths of a line in English. But what of the rest? Does it preserve any feature characteristic of its original? 'Fleecy charge.' It would be curious to know Lucan's opinion of *fleecy charge*.

A little while before we have to translate, has trahe, Caesar, aquas; hoc, si potes, utere caelo,

'Drink, Caesar, of the streams
Drink, if thou can'st, and *should it be thy wish*,
Breathe the Thessalian air.'

This mild apostrophe might have been addressed to a Wordsworthian lamb. 'Drink, pretty creature, drink!' The Nemesis is a fitting one for an unnecessary diffuseness.

Drink of these waters, Caesar, draw this air.
Thou can'st not!

The beginning of book V., the first lines of which are well translated, furnishes an example of how Lucan's force may be dissipated without much exceeding the length of the original:

When all were silent, from his lofty seat
Thus Lentulus began, while stern and sad
The Fathers listened: 'If your hearts still beat
With Latian blood, and if within your breasts
Still lives your fathers' vigour, look not now
On this strange land that holds us, nor enquire
Your distance from the captured city.'—

ut primum maestum tenere silentia
coetum,
Lentulus e celsa sublimis sede profatur:
'Indole si dignum Latia, si sanguine prisco
robur inest animis, non qua tellure coacti
quamque procul tectis captae sedeamus ab
urbis,
cernite,' (15 sqq.)

Here the fullness of expression in 16 and again in the next line is simply the Latin mode of giving clearness and emphasis and does not concern the English translator, who should keep the space he will thus save for other needs.

We might render

When hushed the gloomy concourse, high
enthroned
Spake Lentulus: 'If mighty through your veins
Still surge old Latium's blood, ye will not look
What strange land gathers us, how far we sit
From towers and temples of the captive town.

'May he be conqueror who shall not draw
Against the vanquished an inhuman sword,
Nor count it as a crime if men of Rome
Preferred another's standard to his own.'

VII. 370 sqq. = 312 sqq.

There is nothing poetical in the original here; but this is weak prose. So with the line just above.

'For this hostile chief
Is savage Sulla's pupil.'

cum duce Sullano gerimus ciuilia bella 307

Tis civil war, and yon a Sullan chief!

Nothing is less epic than epigram; and Lucan's mots are a sore trial to the translator. Mr. Ridley however, sometimes puts himself at a needless disadvantage by not observing that where the original ends with a line, the translation must do so too:

quicquid multis peccatur inultum est V.260,

For justice sleeps when thousands share the sin,

loses all its force if thus divided,

'When thousands share the guilt
Crime goes unpunished.'

I have pointed out that in a number of instances Mr. Ridley has missed the meaning of his author. It is fair therefore to add that in one place at least (VII. 699 sq.) he alone, so far as I know, has seen the truth through the misleading vulgate punctuation which I regret to say I allowed to stand in my recent edition of the book. The note of interrogation should be placed after *nefas*, not after *cateruas*, and a comma inserted after *respite*.

Though high praise cannot be awarded to this translation, we may still be glad

that it has been executed. For without the offset of metre, as the present reviewer knows from dreary experience, Lucan is intolerable when translated; and we may freely grant that the modest wish which concludes the preface of Mr. Ridley's book

has been realized, 'I shall be more than satisfied if I have done anything to render the 'Pharsalia' in language, manner and thought more accessible than it has hitherto been to English readers.'

J. P. P.

MOLHUYSEN ON MSS. OF THE ODYSSEY.

De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis scripsit P. C. MOLHUYSEN, Litt. Hum. Dr.: accedunt tabulae quinque. Lugduni-Batavorum. A. W. Sijthoff. MDCCCXCVI. Mark 4.20.

In a short preface Dr. Molhuysen explains his reasons for collating G (Mediceus Laurentianus xxxii. 24 saec. x.), F (Florentinus Laurentianus Conv. Soppr. 52, saec. xi.), and P (Palatinus Heidelbergensis 45, anno 1201):—G had never been completely collated, and Ludwig's collations of F and P betrayed inaccuracy and want of skill. Pp. 3-32 are occupied with Prolegomena to the collation of GFP *cum* A. *Ludwichii* editions. The abbreviations used are explained pp. 153-4. Then follow *corrigenda* and five facsimiles, viz. G φ 399-423, F τ 63-83, and, to show the two chief of the four contemporary hands, P η 96-126, ω 543-548 *cum subscriptione*, and *Batrachomyomachiae finis cum subscriptione*.

The collation of G, the first of its kind, needs no apology; and of Ludwig's collation of F and P our author writes p. 30: 'taliam menda inveni ut libere dicere audeam, Ludwighium non ea esse in legendis libris manuscriptis peritia ut scriptorem ad fidem codicum edere possit.' Certainly the mistakes alleged, pp. 30-32, are sufficient to destroy the authority of any *apparatus criticus*. Some of them one may judge for oneself by consulting the facsimiles: to these may be added τ 67 *ὀππείεις* F according to the facsimile, but Ludwig has turned the present into the future. How serious the divergence between the two collations may be is evident δ 547. According to Ludwig the readings of our three MSS. are κτείναι G, κτείνῃ p.c. P² [and presumably κτείνε F as in the text], but Molhuysen gives κτείναι G, κτείνε F p.c. P², κτάνει a.c. P, κτείνει p.c. P². In short it certainly seems that the authority has vanished of what was our best *apparatus criticus* of the *Odyssey*; though it will always remain to the credit of Prof. Ludwig, that

he so drew attention to these three codices, as to impel Dr. Molhuysen to give us the new collations. But one's faith in collations is sorely shaken, and, if collations of texts can be so faulty, what are we to think of our editions of scholia?

Even the new collation leaves room for criticism. Many orthographical details have been intentionally (p. 28) and, no doubt for the most part, rightly omitted. But one would have gladly been explicitly informed by Dr. Molhuysen, whether a 222 νόνημον is read by GFP though Ludwig failed to find it, or, though GFP read like all other MSS. νόνημον, the mis-spelling was thought too unimportant to be mentioned. So too Molhuysen may very reasonably have agreed with Cauer, *Grundfragen d. hom. Textkritik*, p. 58, that δ 672 ναυόλεται F is worthless as external evidence for the aorist demanded by Paech and Curtius; but it is to be regretted that the reading of F here is simply ignored. Similarly, according to Ludwig and, so far as I can read it, Molhuysen's facsimile, P reads η 107 *καροσσέων* with -σσ-. If so, it is to be regretted that the collation is silent on the matter in view of Bergk's emendation *καρονσσέων* and the inferences drawn from it:—'if we suppose that in an Athenian¹ copy of the *Odyssey* ΚΑΙΡΟΣΕΩΝ was written,...it is easy to understand, how a copyist unacquainted with the rare adjective *καρόεις* made a form *καροσσέων* out of the letters which he did not understand' (Cauer, *l.l.* p. 76). The double -σ- of P is hardly a mere freak of that MS. since it appears in Et. Mg. 499. 43, though see 498. 7, and has only been removed by emendation from Hesychius (see Schmidt, larger edition).

The Prolegomena, after the necessary description of the MSS., show how the

¹ Why Athenian? The Ionian alphabet, as it slowly developed, passed through its *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* in respect to single for double letters, and O=ο or ου: cf. Cauer, *Del.*² 480 (Teos), 486 (Miletos), 491 (Halicarnassos), 496 (Chios), 503 (Samos), 516 (Naxos, *αληον*=*ἀλλέων*), etc.

copyists have corrupted the texts, for (p. 29) the chief aim of palaeography should be to show us 'quid in emendando scriptore licitum sit.' The verses omitted by G, F, or P are discussed severally, and 'haplographia' is illustrated in a very interesting manner. Also of great interest are the illustrations, p. 23, of the effect of the copyists knowing Homer too well: they often substituted the words of a similar verse for what was before them.

All three MSS. are shown to be copies of codices in minuscule script. It is noteworthy that G generally accents κίρνε p. 28 n. (see Chandler, *Gk. Accent.* § 622), and in the dat. pl. and infin. writes more often than other MSS. κώπησ', ἔμμεν' and the like, p. 29, and 'fere semper' (see on α 170) εἶσ'. These elisions must be traceable to the influence of grammatical theories; why εἶσ'? εἶσι is a vox nihili, and we can hardly refer back to a time when the MSS. had ΕΣ = εἶσ'. But the critical signs in G are probably due to the copyist. At least this is Molhuysen's view as to the antisigma (p. 4), and I think it may also apply to the asterisks, which are ascript to α 97-102. The scribe of G seems to have known Homer very well (see Molhuysen, p. 23, and cf. γ 106, 109) and, as all these lines recur, he may have written the asterisk against them on that account: cf. the explanation of this sign by some grammarian in Dindorf, *Schol. in Il.* I. xliv. In favour of this view is the circumstance that the asterisks are ascript, not merely to vv. 97-101, which were rejected by Aristarchus, but to v. 102 (= ω 488, B 167, Ω 121, etc.), which was not and could not be rejected.

It may be worth while to point out that the same MS. preserves a probably unique and ancient form in β 63 ἀσχερα = ἄσχερα: cf. similar forms discussed by Schulze, *Quaest. Ep.* 44 n. Another trace of ancient 'Sandhi' may be found in the reading of GFP α 93 ἐσπάρτην, with which cf. ἐσπηλῆν = ἐς στ. Cauer *Del.*² 483, and see Smyth, *Ionic* p. 598.

One cannot but hope that what Dr. Molhuysen has done for GFP may be done by him or by other palaeographers for other important MSS. such as M, and that on the basis of such improved collations some competent person may attempt to show the relation of our MSS. to one another¹ and to the learned editions of antiquity, and to estimate the value of any single important

MS., in the several parts of the poem, as evidence for or against a given reading. I say, in the several parts, for inasmuch as a single huge roll of papyrus containing the whole *Odyssey* must have always been a rarity, it is therefore probable that the codices were put together from a number of *libelli* often of different origin. At present a reading peculiar to one MS. or to a minority, however old, has only so far the advantage over a modern conjecture, that it is less likely to be a mere conjecture, though it may be due to misreading, or mere carelessness. If such a reading is adopted, as e.g. δ 672 ναυτίλεται is put into the text by Monro (cf. his preface 'pristinam Graecae linguae formam aucupari...nolumus...multis tamen lectionibus ex apparatu critico Arturi Ludwich...desumptis'), then the editor's justification is not the slight external evidence, which at present one cannot evaluate, but the fitness of the reading, its congruity with epic usage, and the probability of its having been the parent or at least the antecedent of the common reading. So, too, the reading of the Genevese papyrus (J. Nicole, *Rev. de Philologie*, 1894, p. 102) γ 372

θάμβησε δὲ λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν
θαύμασ<σ>εν δ' ὁ γεραίός

instead of

θάμβος δ' ἔλε πάντας ἰδόντας
θαύμαζεν δ' ὁ γεραίός

is an indeterminate quantity for us, if we consider it as external evidence against the vulgate. We stand in the same relation to the readings of the scholia. Conservatives and radicals alike act on the principle laid down by Van Leeuwen and Mendes, *Ilias*, p. xxii.: 'singulis locis quid sit legendum non codices grammaticorumve notulae docere nos possunt, sed dictionis epicae leges ex ipso Homero cognitae.' *Apparatus critici* and scholia are chiefly or merely valuable as collections of suggested emendations.

In this matter a review of the MSS. by one skilled in palaeography may render great service. For instance, all known MSS. of the *Odyssey* read καὶ for κατὰ in δ 72. The result is a construction too contorted for it to be probable that the error was deliberately spread by interpolation into texts which preserved κατὰ. Should we refer all our MSS. of δ to a single copy? and was the error due to reading κ' as κ', signs which denote the preposition and conjunction respectively in the papyrus of the Constitution of Athens? The true reading was

¹ See now *Odyssea I.*², edd. Van Leeuwen et Mendes,

preserved as late as the time of schol. T on Ω 323. Something too might be done by one well acquainted with the scholia. For example, on working through the scholia cited by Ludwig AHT i. pp. 46-7 as examples of the terms $\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$, $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$ and the like, it will be found that GFP tend to agree with one another and with the 'inferior' editions or copies: viz: γ 349, ϵ 232, ξ 428, τ 83 GFP have the

reading of the 'inferior' versions, but α 117 P and β 182 GF diverge. Again GFP differ from the 'more exquisite' versions β 170, ζ 291, η 74, \omicron 268, but γ 151 FP and λ 196 G agree with them. All this seems to show that our MS. tradition has preserved a text little influenced by Alexandrian criticism.

C. M. MULVANY.

FRANKLIN'S TRACES OF EPIC INFLUENCE IN THE TRAGEDIES OF AESCHYLUS.

Traces of Epic Influence in the Tragedies of Aeschylus. A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of Bryn Mawr College for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy by S. B. FRANKLIN. Baltimore, 1895.

Dr. Franklin takes as the text of her thesis the well-known saying attributed to Aeschylus, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{o}\tilde{\upsilon}$ $\tau\rho\alpha\gamma\omega\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta$ $\epsilon\iota\tilde{\nu}\alpha\iota$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\text{'}\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\rho\omicron\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu$ $\delta\epsilon\iota\tilde{\nu}\nu\omega\nu$, and examines the Aeschylean plays for traces of Homeric influence in epic forms, in epic vocabulary, and in syntax, subject-matter and style. She finds, as was to be expected, that Homer exercised a strong influence upon the tragedian, both in style and diction and in subject matter. Her work is, on the whole, carefully done, although her lists of parallel passages and word-forms might have been considerably enlarged. The subject of the

thesis was evidently too broad, and might have been divided with profit. I have noted, also, a few misstatements: e.g. it is hardly true that $\mu\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is 'quite frequent in the other tragedians' (p. 11), for in Euripides it is decidedly rare, and in *I. T.* 157 and *Alc.* 122 it rests upon conjecture. The author seems, also, to attribute a somewhat disproportionate importance to Paley's Aeschylus, excellent as that edition is in many respects. On p. 25, note 4 the rule for position before *muta cum liquida* is not clearly stated and needs qualification. Still, the work is in the main meritorious, and might with advantage be expanded into a larger and more comprehensive treatise. The English in which it is written is occasionally somewhat slipshod.

H. W. HAYLEY.

Middletown, Connecticut.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

HEAD'S CATALOGUE OF GREEK COINS.

Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum. Caria, Cos, Rhodes, &c. By BARCLAY V. HEAD, D.C.L. 28s.

A FRESH volume of the British Museum Catalogue of Coins is always welcome, and is sure to contain valuable information. But Caria is scarcely one of the more interesting parts of the Greek world. The islands and a few towns of the coast began to issue money early, but most Carian cities begin to mint only in the Hellenistic age or even later. Thus the light derived from the coins falls mostly on unhistoric days and local cults, rather than on the high-

ways of history. The local cults of Caria have considerable attraction; but the present is scarcely a fitting place for their discussion; therefore we do not propose to examine the volume at length, but only to note a few points.

The coins issued by the Carian Dynasts, Hecatomnus and Mausolus with Milesian types, were attributed by Mr. Head in the Catalogue of Ionia to Miletus: in the present volume he assigns them to Mylasa, but without giving detailed reasons for the change of attribution. The question however has some historic interest, and perhaps required discussion.

Mr. Head well points out that the so-called Rhodian standard of weight (drachm

about 60 grains) did not originate at Rhodes, but at Chios. He thinks that in origin it was a reduction of the Attic standard (drachm 67.5 grains). It occurs to me that it may be not impossibly derived from the standard of the electrum of Cyzicus, which was in use at least as early as B.C. 500.

I may make one or two other suggestions. A hunter charging a boar on a coin of Aphrodisias (Pl. VIII. 4, p. 50) is identified as Adonis. This seems unlikely, as the death of Adonis, not his hunting, is the governing fact. A closely similar figure on the coins of Ephesus is identified by Mr. Head as Androclus, and some such identification would better suit here also. At p. lxxiii. the countermark $\odot\text{EOY}$ on imperial coins of Stratonicea is taken to prove that they were 'guaranteed by the authorities of a temple.' I should prefer to regard the countermark as shewing that they were dedicated in a temple, and thus stamped to prevent their further circulation. At p. 260 the Gorgon-head on the coins of Gorgus at Rhodes is thus described 'Head of Helios or Medusa (?), with winged diadem tied beneath chin.' A more accurate description would be 'Head of Medusa, winged, with snakes tied at throat.' Certainly no diadem appears in the plate (XLV. 3).

However I will not further discuss details, though archaeology differs from law in caring for the smallest detail. To speak of the soundness and accuracy of Mr. Head's work would be superfluous, since these qualities are allowed to it not only in England, but in every University and Academy of Europe. Since the publication of his *Coinage of Syracuse* in 1874 he has not ceased to pour out volume after volume of valuable researches in Greek Numismatics; and the highest praise that can be bestowed on the present volume is that it is worthy to stand beside the rest.

PERCY GARDNER.

MONTHLY RECORD.

ITALY.

Rondissone, Piedmont.—A curious glass vessel in the form of a swan has been found here; it appears to have been a child's toy, perhaps used as a rattle. These objects are rare but not unknown; another, now destroyed, is said to have been found with that here described, together with a coin of Domitian. The vessel is completely closed up, but is broken at the tail.¹

Cologna, Venetia.—Fibulae of various types have recently been found here, belonging to the Egean and Roman epochs. Among them may be mentioned a boat-shaped fibula with long sheath-like foot; on

the bow are three small figures of monkeys drinking; another boat-shaped fibula with ten rings along the bow, to which a chain is attached. Other bronze objects have also come to light, including pendants, part of a belt with incised spirals like those in Mycenaean work and rosettes in circles, a knife with elegant handle, and the handles of a situla.¹

Basciano (Picenum).—A tomb of pre-historic date has been discovered, which contained a fibula of exceptional size, of the type known as 'leaf-shaped with disc.' The bow is in the form of a flat oval disc with incised chevron-patterns; the foot ends in an elliptical piece on which are incised elaborate systems of lines in squares. In the same tomb were found four discs of bronze with simple incised patterns.¹

Bacucco (Picenum).—A small terra-cotta altar has been found with relief representing a contest between a Greek and an Amazon. A similar altar has been found at Atri in the same neighbourhood. In this locality has also been found a fibula of the simplest and earliest type, like a modern safety-pin.¹

Tortoreto (Picenum).—Two interesting terra-cottas have recently been found here; both are antefixal ornaments. The first represents a slave with comic mask, in a pensive attitude, resting one hand on an amphora; on the other side of him is a palm-branch. The other is in the form of a nude youth, rather corpulent, who plays the double flute; on either side of him is an amphora. It perhaps represents a *nannus*.¹

Arezzo.—Some finds of interesting Aretine vases have lately been made. They are stamped with the names of Saturninus M. Perennis and Crescentis M. Perennis; other specimens of evidently later date bear the names of Bargates and M. Tigranes. Among the subjects represented may be mentioned: (1) a man with a comic mask, another with an ass's head; and a third with a bearded old man's mask; (2) man with comic mask, dancer in grotesque attitude, and man running away, carrying a strainer; (3) a man of monkey-like appearance, and another lying covered up on a couch. Other fragments bear similar subjects.²

Bolsena.—Some interesting specimens of the late *vasi dorati* (or *inargentati*) with figures in relief have lately come to light. They resemble a group of vases from Bolsena now in the Brit. Mus. (*Cat. G* 179-194). The best specimen is a krater with masks and figures repeated two or three times, representing Athena and Odysseus, Herakles and a woman, Zeus (?), bearded, with cornucopia, and Hera (?), with sceptre. It is almost identical with the vase *G* 180 in the Brit. Mus. Part of another vase had heads of Herakles and Hera (compare coins of Hirina); and an askos with heads of Medusa may also be mentioned. Fragments of four Campanian phialae with reliefs of Herakles and Omphale also came to light.³

Foggio Somnavilla (Sabini).—An interesting necropolis has been investigated. It contained bucchero vases and other local fabrics, as well as Greek vases, some proto-Corinthian, others (kylikes) of the black figure period. Among the local specimens some are curious, e.g. a large spherical *olla* on which are incised two figures of winged horses; a covered amphora stamped with a frieze of rude horses; a similar amphora with two friezes of horses, some led by men, interspersed with anchors (?); and a small flask of curious shape, the sides folded over like an opening bud; on either side is a bird within a twisted ring, and on the neck are inscriptions in early Italian characters.²

H. B. WALTERS.

² *Notizie degli Scavi*, Nov. 1896.

³ *Notizie degli Scavi*, Oct. 1896.

¹ *Notizie degli Scavi*, Dec. 1896.